



The RESISTER®

The Official Publication
of the Special Forces Underground

Volume II

Fall 1995

Number 2

Federal "Crimes" are Derived From Treaties With Foreign Powers

by
Lowell H. Becraft, Jr.

BY STATUTE, all federal agencies must confine their activities to the jurisdiction delegated to them; see 5 U.S.C., §558. While this is a simple statutory command, there is an evident problem in that most federal agencies fail to publish any statements, either in the C.F.R. or some other source, which define their jurisdiction. The C.I.A. is one agency where it is easy to determine its jurisdiction because a statute has deprived it of any domestic jurisdiction; see *Weissman v. C.I.A.*, 565 F.2d 692, 696 (D.C. Cir. 1977).¹ However, to determine the jurisdiction of other agencies such as yours requires some study.

Perhaps the best way to determine the jurisdiction of any given federal agency is to examine various cases regarding the subject matter of that agency. For example, the United States Constitution does not provide that Congress has any authority concerning the fish and wildlife within this country and this has been noted in several cases. In *McCready v. Virginia*, 94 U.S. 391, 394, 395 (1877), the Supreme Court held regarding the fish within the oceans:

The States own the tidewaters themselves and the fish in them, so far as they are capable of ownership while running.... The title thus held is subject to the paramount right of navigation, the regulation of which, in respect to foreign and

Continued on page 16

"The Best in Federal Law Enforcement"

by
Z.B. Vance

IN MID-AUGUST, *Resister* federal law enforcement sources report, all Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms field offices received a headquarters memo restating procedures for the proper disposal of classified documents, this in response to a Federal Bureau of Investigation report on how dozens of secret and top secret documents from one of ATF's most sensitive covert facilities had been acquired by *Soldier of Fortune* magazine.

The FBI investigation of ATF could not have come at a worse time. U.S. Rep. Louise Slaughter, herself an ATF apologist, said the ATF Waco raid failed because "there was no security." ATF Director John Magaw testified that OPSEC is now a top priority. Magaw, in woe-is-us testimony praised his agents as "the best in federal law enforcement" and solemnly vowed that all OPSEC deficiencies have been corrected.

Continued on page 14

Post Office Box 47095, Kansas City, Missouri, 64188

Copy _____ of 1500 Copies

©Copyright 1995 by *The RESISTER*. All rights reserved. Produced and distributed in compliance with DA PAM 190-2; AR 210-10; AR 600-20; AR 360-5; 18 USC, § 2385, 2387 and Uniform Code of Military Justice. Requests to duplicate this publication by printed or electronic means must be submitted to the above address. Allow 8 weeks for response. Permission is granted to subscribers to make **white** duplicates of this publication.

Open Letter to Our Readers

Capitalists Armed!

SINCE it was introduced in June 1994, *The RESISTER* has become one of the most popular antifederalist publications in the United States. This is remarkable because it is a clandestine publication produced by United States Army Special Forces soldiers. *The RESISTER* is the psychological warfare organ of the Special Forces Underground. SFU is an association of Special Forces soldiers who know that taking no action against this nation's unchecked decent into socialism and totalitarianism is the very antithesis of their responsibility to defend the Constitution "...against all enemies, foreign and domestic..." and to "...bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

The Army Chain of Command's response to *The RESISTER* is a frightening indicator of the political course this nation is following. It has been smeared by communists as an "extremist" publication, without of course the term "extremism" ever being defined. (They mean it is anti-communist.) It has been reviled by racists as a "supremacist" publication, without of course the term "supremacist" ever being defined. (They mean it is anti-multiculturalist.) It has been officially banned from military libraries and bases, despite regulations that explicitly protect it from such arbitrary actions, and rulings by MACOM Judge Advocates General and Inspectors General that *The RESISTER* is legal. Its authors, observers, and associates have been hunted and threatened with expulsion from the military if caught. Mere possession of *The RESISTER* by military personnel carries the implied threat of punitive punishment, and vocal support of *The RESISTER* and its policies has been punished by the arbitrary use of force by fraud.

This official response is singularly unsettling considering the official policy statement of the Special Forces Underground:

The philosophy of the Special Forces Underground and *The RESISTER* is straightforward: individual rights, strict constitutionalism, limited government, isolationism, laissez-faire capitalism, and republicanism; in short, the principles upon which this nation was founded.

We oppose: statism, socialism, collectivism, racism, altruism, internationalism, unlimited democracy, pull politics, and the "New World Order," in short, the ideologies of all tyrannies.

Consider the logical implications of the official response to *The RESISTER* when juxtaposed to the above stated philosophy of the Special Forces Underground.

The Special Forces Underground and *The RESISTER* are the only pro-constitutional, pro-capitalist, pro-isolationist voice in the United States military. We will never compromise with communists, socialists or totalitarians on any issue. This begs the question, "What principles do you want the United States Army to stand for?"

Would you prefer an Army of patriots willing to fight to preserve the unalienable rights of individuals, or an Army of politically correct sycophants driven by the range-of-the-moment whims of whatever mob gains momentary ascendancy?

Would you prefer an Army devoted to defending the original, strictly defined, constitutional limits on government power, or an Army of toadies serving whatever political gang decides the Constitution is a "living document" they can

Why The Resister?

by

Keven L. Jamison
Counsel, *The RESISTER*

IT HAS been suggested that it is bad for serving Special Forces soldiers to speak out on political issues. The American military has a long tradition of being non-political. It is suggested that *The RESISTER* violates this tradition. The tradition is actually political non-involvement, of being good soldiers, of going anywhere, anytime, to kill and die when told, and only when told.

Thirty years ago soldiers answered this call without question, and this year found that the architect of that war (Robert Stange McNamara) never believed they could win and personally put every possible obstacle in the way of winning. Our comrades were killed with enemy equipment freighted unmolested past American warships, unloaded unmolested in enemy harbors, stored unmolested in enemy safe areas, and used by an enemy who could not be attacked unless they fired first, and sometimes not even then.

Two hundred and twenty years ago American soldiers were given newspapers to remind them what they were fighting for. One hundred thirty years ago songs were written to remind soldiers of both sides what they were fighting for. Half a century ago movies were made to show soldiers what they were fighting for. Soldiers were expected to kill and die for a cause, had confidence in what that cause was, and expected that their political leaders believed in that cause.

In the last thirty years soldiers have not had newspapers, songs, movies, or the confidence that their political leaders actually meant what they said. They have been proven correct in every instance.

When soldiers kill, they mean it. When soldiers die, other soldiers take it seriously. *The RESISTER* is a reminder to American politicians that the United States Army is watching them. American soldiers will no longer die easily to promote your personal and party agendas.

Continued on page 29

EDITORIALS

No man's life, liberty, or property is safe while the legislature is in session.

Judge Gideon J. Tucker, 1866

In Defense of Specialist Michael New

EVERY United States soldier takes a sacred oath. The Oath of Enlistment states: "I (state your name), do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me God." This is not a loyalty oath sworn to a person, or a mystic oath sworn to a symbol, nor is it a statist oath sworn to an abstraction. It is an oath sworn to support and defend the very legal and philosophical foundations of the United States. It is also an oath to uphold the good order and discipline of its armed forces.

The Oath of Enlistment is a sworn allegiance to the legal and philosophical foundations of this nation represented by the Constitution and the writings of the Framers (both the federalists and the antifederalists). Adherence to contrary philosophies, support of contradictory political systems, or advocacy of institutions and organizations that undermine the Constitution is, at best, subversion. Actively working to advance contrary philosophies, promote contradictory political systems, and participation in institutions and organizations that undermine the Constitution is nothing less than treason.

The United Nations is an organization that was conceptualized, promoted, and finally established by communists and their sympathizers. The U.N. Charter abrogates any pretense of national sovereignty. The U.N. constitution is based on the 1930's Stalinist constitution of the USSR. The UN declaration of "human rights" is a monument to the evils of altruism (which is the philosophical precondition of communism.) The U.N. is a cabal of Third World parasites, Second World moochers, and First World socialists presiding over the destruction of capitalism in America while vying for the inevitable spoils and loot. The U.N. and everything it stands for are the very antithesis of the principles of Life, Liberty, and Property embodied in the Constitution of the United States. The U.N. is a foreign power by definition, and it is a foreign enemy by its actions. In the United States, persons who promote the U.N. and organizations that advance it are domestic enemies and traitors.

Keeping the above in mind, any United States soldier who voluntarily promotes the U.N., and willingly serves under U.N. command in any capacity, is violating the oath he took to support and defend the Constitution against "all enemies, foreign and domestic." Any United States soldier who serves under U.N. auspices is serving a foreign power under foreign command and therefore abrogates his status as a United States soldier. His loyalty has been transferred and his oath has been negated. No matter how many American commanders are interposed between the soldier on the ground and the policy makers, the policy makers ultimately sit in the U.N. Building. Thus any pronouncement that no U.S. servicemen will serve under foreign command is a lie.

Specialist Michael New, by refusing to wear uniform items that represent a foreign power that is inimical to his nation, and by refusing to have his loyalty transferred to a foreign power that exists as the antithesis of the Constitution he is sworn to support and defend, has demonstrated the moral integrity and principled action of a truly honorable man. He stands in contradistinction to those in his chain of command who have threatened him with courts martial for refusing to yield, for refusing to compromise, and for refusing to surrender his integrity.

Specialist New's chain of command is not concerned with issues of moral integrity, honor, or the unconstitutionality of transferring a U.S. soldier's loyalty

to a hostile foreign power against his will. They will adhere to their legal position under the UCMJ that SPC New is refusing to obey a lawful order, and in their limited sphere of action they are within their exercise of authority to administer judicial or non-judicial punishment as they wish.

Disobedience does not frighten the chain of command. They have ample resources at their disposal to deal with it. Those "mystics of muscle" will punish Specialist New's body for refusing to represent his nation's enemies. They will have no reservations about doing so, nor do they fear for the consequences because, among themselves, there will be none.

The hypocrisy of SPC New's chain of command, and the injustice of the issue involved here, is that officers have the option of resigning their commission in protest to orders they believe to be illegal or unconstitutional. Enlisted soldiers cannot resign. They either obey and compromise their moral integrity, or they disobey and are punished. This makes SPC New's refusal to compromise his integrity all the more remarkable. He is surrendering the furtherance of his planned career for a greater value—his own integrity—but he has refused to become a sacrificial animal (i.e., claim his actions were *for* "someone else.")

Specialist New's principled stand will not make him a martyr, regardless of the feverish attempts of irrationalists to convert him into one. What it will do is demonstrate for all soldiers two invaluable lessons. First, the inevitable consequences of principled action in an organization commanded by unprincipled men. Second, the one thing the pragmatists who command them fear above all else is a mind they cannot reach.

Melancton Smith

Joseph McCarthy Was Right

READ any school or university textbook on American History and you will find any reference to Senator Joseph McCarthy loaded with hysterical denunciations of him. He is reviled for creating a "climate of fear" and excoriated for questioning the loyalty of government employees. The term coined to describe McCarthy's investigation of Communist Party United States of America infiltration of the U.S., state and local governments since the founding of the CPUSA is "McCarthyism." To this day, any denunciation of communists or communism is smeared by both liberals and conservatives as "McCarthyism."

The smear term "McCarthyism" is directly associated with the other smear term favored by communists—"extremism." Both these terms are *anti-concepts*. An anti-concept is a superfluous and rationally unusable term designed to replace cognitive thought and reason with animal-like feelings and instinctual negative reactions. The purpose of an anti-concept is to instill in discourse a sense of *approximate* understanding. "McCarthyism" is indefinable, describes exactly nothing, and suggests some unnamed evil. The alleged interpretation of this term revolves around such amorphous ideas as reckless use of unverified charges and guilt by association. What it really means is "anti-communism." The anti-concept "extremism" is 'felt' to mean prejudice, racism, bigotry, conspiratorial theories, and advocacy of violence. What it really means is "pro-capitalism."

Joseph McCarthy is most vehemently denounced for investigating communist infiltration of the federal government in general and the U.S. State Department in particular. Note for the record that the shrillest attacks on McCarthy stem from his investigations of those who protected known communists. The simple fact is that McCarthy was right. Throughout the 1920's CPUSA had been encouraging its members to seek government employment under direction of the Soviet COMINTERN. But the real communist push occurred during the presidency of communist sympathizer and protector, Franklin D. Roosevelt (president Clinton's hero). By the time that crippled traitor, who's socialist programs survive to this day, had the good grace to die in office, key positions in the Department of Agriculture, the Government Printing Office, the Department of State, the Democrat Party, Congress, major newspapers, the movie "industry," labor unions, schools, and defense industries, were thoroughly penetrated by communists or their sympathizers. McCarthy's "crime" was exposing them.

The consequences of the attacks on McCarthy have been largely indirect. It early became apparent to politicians that any attempt to purge communists who were (and are) devoted to the eventual destruction of the Constitution and the republican form of government would be met with hysterics in the communist sympathizing media, academia, and from within the halls of Congress itself. The most important lesson McCarthy taught was that noting who *protects* communists, who advances and promotes their ideas, and who finances their programs, is as equally important as exposing the actual reds.

We note for the record that, without exception, every single person McCarthy questioned about being a communist, or implicated as working to advance the cause of communism, was subsequently found to be a communist, or actively working to advance communist causes. 60 years of uninterrupted communist influence within, and on the periphery of, American government has delivered us to the brink of outright socialism. Mikhail Gorbachev, former president of the communist Soviet Union—who still refers to himself as a "convinced communist," occupies quarters at the former U. S. Army base Presidio of San Francisco publishing papers that call for the "convergence" of the U.S. and (still communist) Russia while our red press swoons over his every word. Our Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff uses your taxes to visit his native (still communist) Georgia to extol the virtues of "cooperation" and deploys the U.S. Army to (still communist) East European countries to promote "democracy" and "human rights." Convergence, cooperation, democracy, and human rights are all time honored communist bromides.

We have a president who actively supported communist North Viet Nam

while he was dodging the draft and learning the virtues of international socialism at Oxford. A president who traveled to the Soviet Union with friends who are now communist party officials in Italy, and who later married some female known to her classmates at Yale as, "Hillary The Red."

Communists shriek that ideas are protected by the First Amendment. We emphatically agree. In fact, we actually like listening to communists spew their filth because we get to note who is a communist and who subsequently spreads their ideas around. But when ideas that, by definition, abrogate individual rights, liberty, and private property are put into practice, those implementing and enforcing such practices lose all claims to rights themselves.

Some day, when the true extent of CPUSA and liberal treason is known, Joseph McCarthy will be revered as an American Hero.

J.F.A. Davidson

Statement of Policy

The philosophy of the Special Force Underground and *The RESISTER* is straightforward: individual rights, strict constitutionalism, limited government, isolationism, laissez-faire capitalism, and republicanism; in short, the principles upon which this nation was founded.

We oppose: statism, socialism, collectivism, racism, altruism, internationalism, tribalism, unlimited democracy, pull politics, and the "New World Order;" in short, the ideologies of all tyrannies.

Our philosophical framework is Ayn Rand's Objectivism (the rational morality of self interest—which means; **Life**). Our political philosophy is grounded in the works of the Framers of the Constitution and Auberon Herbert (government as servant, not master—which means; **Liberty**). Our economic philosophy is grounded in the works of Adam Smith, Carl Menger, Ludwig von Mises, and Henry Hazlitt (the guarantor of individual rights, laissez-faire capitalism—which means; **Property**).

We do not advocate the overthrow of the U.S. government. We do advocate resistance to government tyranny at all levels. We do not advocate the initiation of force in doing so. We do advocate appropriate force-in-kind in retaliation. We advocate active resistance against the United Nations.

Our goal is the restoration of the Constitutional Republic. Our aim is to see the federal government defanged, muzzled, shackled and cast back into its constitutional prison.

**Democracy and socialism
are inseparable.**

V. I. Lenin

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR ROBERT S. MCNAMARA:
Having just finished reading your book, *In Retrospect*, and as a Vietnam War veteran, I can honestly say I have more respect for the Viet Cong and the NVA than for you and President Clinton, who admires your book so much. You sent me and my friends to die for *no reason*. I made it back. My friends did not. You call the Vietnam War a MISTAKE! I call you a traitor and your conduct of the Vietnam War treason.

Next time you write a book, write about Cinton's passport and why he guards it so passionately. Write about his support of "former" Soviet politicians and why he campaigns vigorously for socialism. Write about his two old friends, Antonio Verrocchio and Francesco Graziani, and their meeting in Italy prior to the Normandy ceremonies. Who are those two? Present members of the local communist party who toured the Soviet Union with Clinton from 31 December, 1969, to 10 January, 1970, while loyal Americans were being killed in Vietnam.

Speedy
F/51 (LRRP) RVN
O/75 Ranger RVN
Austin, TX

Sorry, we could not forward your letter to Bob as you requested. We do not correspond with the opposition, it is a waste of paper. Particularly on traitors.

JFA Davidson

I HAVE just read Vol.I, No.4, which I received today in white duplicate. I am a former naval officer, Vietnam era veteran, with ASW and nuclear weapons training. I am now a writer, editor and literary agent. I am deeply concerned that America is being sold out by high-level officials conspiring to a New World Order which will trash the Constitution and individual rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I am puzzled by one theoretical point in No.4; your condemnation of democracy. I sense that you have a soundly reasoned position, but it sure escapes me. I regard America as a democratic republic. You seem to want only a republic. What's wrong with democracy. How is it incompatible with republican government?

J. White
Cheshire, Connecticut

A fair question.

We bring to your attention the fact that no where in either the Declaration of Independence, Articles of Confederation, or the Constitution, is the word "democracy" once mentioned. In fact, the Framers held democracy to be the antithesis of the principles of constitutional republicanism. Even cursory study of the early republic reveals that there were sound restrictions on the franchise. Many states wisely limited the franchise to property owners, freeholders, owners of their means of livelihood and production, etc. The Constitution deliberately restricted the scope of national elections to the popular election of the House of Representatives. Senators were elected by state legislature, and the president by the Electoral College; both limitations specifically intended to prevent popular elections to fill those offices.

Our objection is not with limited democratic process and restricted franchise. These are the historical bases of constitutional republicanism. They ensure liberty against the inevitable consequences of ballots in the hands of altruists, tribalists, and collectivists.

Our objection is to unlimited democracy and the universal franchise—the foundations of mob rule. They guarantee the consequences of altruism, tribalism and collectivism—the political gang warfare of pressure groups and special interests. Unlimited democracy and universal franchise are the prerequisites of

socialism and they must inevitably lead to totalitarianism.

If you don't believe this, just look around you.

Melancton Smith

GUN CONTROL, so-called, is a fraud perpetrated by those who are fundamentally opposed to the doctrine of universal individual sovereignty. Proponents of gun control are, philosophically, pacifists or statist. The stated purpose of gun control, reducing crime and violence, has never succeeded in doing either, no matter how thoroughly it has been tried. This is as good a case that can be made that gun control disarms only the innocent and increases violent crime overall. While the purposes for which it is proposed are dubious, its intent is clearly to de-institutionalize, once and for all, the doctrine of universal individual sovereignty. The purpose of gun control is to deprive the people of their final means of resisting incursions upon their lives, property, and liberty: armed force.

Arms are the power of the sovereign, whether that sovereign is one man or a billion. If the doctrine of universal individual rights is to triumph on this planet, "the last best hope on earth"—the United States of America—must preserve the power of its people to defend the rights of its people.

Uncle J.
Elmira, NY

DIALECTICAL Materialism is the official philosophy of the Communist Party. Everyone has to take indoctrination courses in it, and everyone is expected to study it. It is a collection of trivialities that has no other use than to justify the inconsistencies of the ever-changing party line. (The following story illustrates this.)

Kohn was studying dialectics in preparation for one of the periodic purges. But he could not make head or tail of it, so he went to his Rabbi.

"Dialectics?" says the Rabbi.

"Easy; I'll explain it to you. Two chimneysweeps fall down a chimney into the fireplace. One is clean, the other is black with soot. Which one goes to wash himself?"

"The dirty one, of course."

The RESISTER

"Wrong! The dirty one sees the clean one and thinks he is clean too; the clean one sees the other covered with soot, so *he* goes to wash. Let's try again. Two chimneysweeps fall down a chimney. One is clean, the other is dirty; which one goes to wash?"

"Why, you just said the clean one."

"Wrong! Each looks at his own hands, and the one with dirty hands goes to wash himself. Try again. Two chimneysweeps fall down the chimney. Which one goes to wash himself?"

"All right, the dirty one then!"

"Wrong! Neither; the dirty one sees the clean one, and the clean one looks at his hands. Try again. Two chimneysweeps.... "Stop, Rabbi, stop!" cries Kohn. "You're simply twisting things to make them come out whichever way you want!"

"Now you've got the idea!" says the Rabbi. "That's what dialectics is all about..."

Thomas Dorman, MD
San Luis Obispo, CA

Dr. Dorman, a staunch anti-Communist, publishes a private newsletter for his patients and friends entitled NewsletteR, which treats issues related to alternative health care, philosophy, and generally, whatever interests him. Dr. Dorman's monthly NewsletteR is not available commercially, but if you are interested in obtaining six copies twice per year send \$50.00 (to cover production and postage) to:

Thomas A. Dorman, M.D.

171 N. Santa Rosa Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

This does not constitute an endorsement. We simply were impressed by his May 1995 Communism issue.

The Staff

I MUST challenge your stated view in the last issue that our armed service members should not refuse to serve or to do their duty. While I have no military background I do have historical and legal perspective enough to know there is no constitutional authority or obligation to serve worldwide as interim U.N. global-cop until the U.N. has its own permanent military. I have seen bumper stickers saying "Marines—World's 911 Call," and have been told by an active duty airhead that the

U.S. Constitution and the U.N. Charter are the same thing and that is what he was taught in his training. Needless to say I find that offensive.

As a soldier you enlist in the U.S. military with an oath to the U.S. Constitution only. The only authority this gives is to defend the borders and people of this country under a declaration of war by Congress. (Soldiers) should, in conscience, refuse anything else and take the consequences. If I was in the service I would not serve in Bosnia, Haiti, Iraq, etc. as a U.N. toady nor let any of my kids do so.

Without the U.S. military the New World Order is kaput. So be it. To (serve the U.N.) makes one an accomplice to treason (and a) partner in crime. If this publication is genuine, live up to your name, Resister.

Anonymous

(Post Mark: Tallahassee, FL)

P.S. Why is no one in Congress (or the) military challenging Clinton on PDD-25, and why is *The Resister* a source of concern to the Pentagon as claimed by CJCS on *60 Minutes*, if he isn't doing anything unconstitutional or unpatriotic as you correctly believe (he is)?

*Although we agree with your assessment of the United Nations, what you are suggesting is that **The RESISTER** should engage in sedition generally, and incite mutiny within the ranks in particular. We adamantly reject that notion and we are on record expressing that we disdain such activities, and we do not tolerate even passing references to them. What an individual soldier does is his own responsibility.*

*In answer to your questions: 1) no one in Congress is challenging PDD-25 because Congress is controlled by internationalists and socialists, and 2) **The RESISTER** is a source of concern to GEN Shalikashvili because it encourages soldiers to do the one thing socialists cannot tolerate; uphold the Constitution—the real one, not the floating abstraction called a "living document."*

JFA Davidson

IT is gratifying to know your organization exists and is gaining strength during these times of murkiness and despair. I too am a

member of the United States armed forces and I am proud to serve this great country. Although I have not always felt the cause was just (Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti) my participation in those operations was conducted as any good soldier would; as ordered.

This is not to say I have not questioned the orders I was given, in my thoughts and in private circles, but only insofar as any thinking human would ponder the world around him.

Also, as an officer, I feel it my duty to verify the thoroughness of the plans that I am asked to lead and execute regardless of size or scope. But what happens when my moral sense is completely at odds with the orders I am given? Somalia is an example of this. I was personally responsible for the delivery of 240,000 pounds of food stuff per week to the Somali people. Many, if not all, of those people were undernourished, uneducated and uninformed (who) were interested in their own survival. This was not the case with some Somalis though, and the result was the loss of many young American lives. Yet, I continued to follow the flawed orders of those appointed over me because that is what I was sworn to do. All the while I felt more and more detached from any sense of duty and increasingly as if I was "just doing my job."

The same sense carried with me during my participation in operations in Bosnia and Haiti. It is my belief that those at the highest levels have lost sight of what is right and what is wrong and instead are pursuing their own personal interests at the cost of others. The saying "loose sight, loose fight" comes to mind. The highest levels of our government have lost sight and when we try to delude ourselves into thinking otherwise they do their best to remind us—Randy Weaver, Waco, the Crime Bill, etc.. Subsequently, we as patriotic Americans are losing the fight; the fight for freedom and the basic principles set down in the Constitution.

All this has caused my allegiance to drift away from what I am being asked to defend (constitutional infringements, killing U.S. citizens under color of uniform) and toward what I was originally asked to defend—the United States Constitution.

Continued on page 12

Vol. II, No. 2

PERINTREP

Nothing is Too Good for The Communists

COLONEL Mark Boyatt, Commander, 3d Special Forces Group (Abn), completed his August whirlwind *tour d'Afrique* in grand style. In discussions with South Africa's Minister of Defense, and army commanders loyal to communist South Africa President Mandela, COL Boyatt agreed to a schedule of Joint Combined Exercise for Training (JCET) rotations for Company C, 3d Battalion, 3d SFG(A).

There are two issues involved here.

The first issue is the term JCET which, when applied to 3d SFG(A) deployments to Africa, is a lie. What really occurs is what old-hands know as a Mobile Training Team (MTT). When 3d SFG(A) Detachments deploy to African countries there is exactly zero "joint training" taking place. For the most part, Detachments conduct light infantry training courses for indigenous forces. In other words, they are teaching and advising—the classic description of an MTT.

The significance of this lie has to do with funding. Since the money available for MTTs is paltry compared to that available for JCETs, those who arrange such missions (and brief them to Congress) simply lie about the intent and conduct of the missions. We believe this is called "misappropriation of government funds."

All lies require a back-stop, preferably a back-stop that is true but exists out of context. Lying about missions in order to tap into inappropriate funding is no different. For a JCET to be approved it must be demonstrated that the SF Detachment will derive the greater benefit from the training. Since even a retard could figure out that an SF Detachment training with a Third World armed gang would not be the beneficiaries of the training, a back-stop "truth" is used to justify it.

The back-stop is that by conducting training for the benefit of Third World armed gangs the soldiers on the SF Detachments are gaining the most benefit because they are conducting the training. This of course is true, but it is in the wrong context. It does not cancel the original lie because the Detachments are *performing* MTTs, not JCETs.

The second issue is that almost without exception 3d SFG(A) is being used to professionalize the armies of communist governments. In May 1995, President Clinton met with his pal and former communist guerrilla leader President Mugabe of Zimbabwe (we will always remember it affectionately as Rhodesia). Scant weeks after Mugabe again threatened to confiscate the property of white farmers, FOB 33(-) deployed to Zimbabwe as the Theater asset for Flintlock II and to coordinate training for the Zimbabwean army. (So the only productive property in Zimbabwe—that owned by white Rhodesians—can later be confiscated more efficiently?)

The other communist countries frequented by 3d SFG(A) are Namibia, Botswana, Malawi, and Zambia (late Northern Rhodesia, which calls it's economy "commandist" when Americans are around). 3d SFG(A) frequents Uganda also; however it is difficult to describe the Ugandan government as communist, "looters" seems more appropriate. It is interesting to note that when 3d SFG(A) does not have a Detachment in Zambia the Chinese Communist People's Liberation Army is a persistent presence in that country. For years the State Department and EUCOM have been pushing to get Detachments into communist Tanzania, communist Angola, and communist Mozambique. Next year, 3d SFG(A) plans to deploy units to communist South Africa.

The reds in the State department want to ensure their comrades in Africa get the best training your misappropriated tax dollars can buy.

Training the armies of communist countries is called "promoting human rights and democracy;" time honored communist bromides.

Police Militarization Continues

MESSAGE traffic originating from Combined Joint Task Force - Six J3, dated 141631Z JUL 95 (message ID 1951846), destined for all active duty Army Special Forces Groups, Navy and Air Force Special Operations units and support units, described unresourced counterdrug Mobile Training Team missions for Fiscal year 96. Information copies were sent to, among others, Operation Alliance (Ft. Bliss, TX), (a farce, since the unresourced requirements were forwarded through them to JTF-Six to begin with), Project Northstar (Buffalo, NY), and Office of the Secretary of Defense, OCDEP-S/OSD-ISA. An information copy to this last office is not necessarily ominous, but it is...interesting. The message also announced the JTF - Six Semiannual Planning Conference.

The JTF - Six Semiannual Planning Conference was held at JTF - Six Headquarters on Biggs Army Airfield, Ft. Bliss, TX, and the Ft. Bliss NCO Club between 19 - 21 September 1995. During this conference, unit participation in FY 96 missions was solicited. Missions specifically directed to United States Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) continue the progressive militarization of local police departments.

The missions designated for USASOC include fourteen Close Quarter Battle (CQB) and Advanced Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain (AMOUT) missions at the following locations:

Burlington, VT Sheriff Patrol
(09 Oct - 13 Oct 95)

Niagara Falls, NY Sheriff Office
(16 Oct - 20 Oct 95)

Columbus, OH Police Department
(16 Oct - 20 Oct 95)

Atlantic City, NJ Police Department
(23 Oct - 27 Oct 95)

Rochester, NY Police Department

(23 Oct - 27 Oct 95)
N. Franklin Township, PA Police
Department
(30 Oct - 03 Nov 95)
Philadelphia, PA
(29 Jan - 02 Feb 96)
Seattle, WA
(11 Mar - 15 Mar 96)
Steamwood, IL
(18 Mar - 22 Mar 96)
Montreal, QE
(22 Apr - 26 Apr 96)
Cambridge, OH Sheriff Patrol
(06 May - 10 May 96)
Keyes, ME
(20 May - 24 May 96)
Camp Ripley, MN
(03 Jun - 07 Jun 96)
Idaho (loc unspecified)
(03 Jun - 07 Jun 96)

The Rochester, NY Police Department also requested a "Tactical Commander's Course" to better learn how to use their newly militarized cops (13 Nov - 17 Nov 95).

Yet more chilling, is a request by an anonymous entity referred to only as "REG CD TNG" in Mississippi, for a Special Forces MTT to integrate Close Quarter Battle (CQB) techniques onto "an existing school curriculum." (04 Nov - 09 Nov 95). Since there are no CQB teams in CONUS this mission will likely be picked up by SFOD-D. (*SFOD-D's mission is no longer limited to counterterrorism—just thought you'd like to know that. Editor*).

Here is a curious one. The Newark, NJ FBI office requested an MTT for "ship boarding and searching techniques...tactical movement, basic map and compass techniques and day/night movements." (16 Oct - 20 Oct 95). During this same time period, the Forsyth County, NC Sheriff Office requested, "...patrolling, land navigation, booby trap recognition and weapons training."

Eight sniper MTTs were designated for USASOC.

US Attorney, Houston, TX
(12 Feb - 17 Feb 96)
FBI, Kansas, (loc unspecified)
(09 Oct - 14 Oct 95)
Portland, OR
(27 Nov - 01 Dec 95)
Idaho (loc unspecified)
(29 Jan - 02 Feb 96)
Streamwood, IL
(05 Aug - 09 Aug 96)
Franklin, PA

(19 Aug - 23 Aug 96)
Atlantic City, NJ
(26 Feb - 01 Mar 96)
Camp Perry, OH
(02 Oct - 06 Oct 96)
There are dozens more, ranging from Field Tactical Police Operations, to intelligence operations and Russian (!) and Spanish language training.

Since all these missions are "legal," and "within the bounds of the Constitution"—the Department of the Army said so, so it must be true—and since you are annually extorted at gun-point to pay for all this, the public and press are cordially invited to be present and observe training on the dates and at the locations cited above. Please contact your local police or sheriff department for details. The Point of Contact at JTF - Six for these, and other missions, is Major Deverill, at (915) 586-9083. or MSG Batta, at (915) 586-8497.

Defense attorneys who wish to be proactive should prepare their lawsuits in advance, based on the rulings of *Popow v. City of Margate*, 476 Federal Supplement, 127 (D.N.J., 1979), in the event these public defenders decide to actually use the training they are given by their legally unqualified, and therefore incompetent, military trainers. SFU can provide expert defense witnesses for AMOUT, CQB, and sniper related law suits. They are expensive, but they are *good*.

Horiuchi and FBI HRT "Snipers" Take the 5th

LON HORIUCHI, member of the FBI's Hostage Rescue Team (HRT), alleged "Quarter Club" sniper in said unit, and world renowned woman killer, exercised his Constitutional right against self incrimination on 06 September, 1995, during closed testimony in the congressional hearings on the Weaver case. While speculation surrounding his refusal to testify centers around who gave what order when, the real reason does not rest on his ability to follow orders. His ability to do so has already been demonstrated. Indeed, as we reported in our Vol.II, No.1 issue, he told one of our observers that he "jumped on it" when the rules

of engagement changed, and that he has no remorse about killing Vicki Weaver.

The real reason he refused to testify rests on his professional competence as a "sniper." He actually used the techniques taught to him by the USMC Scout Sniper Instructor School at Quantico, VA, and relied upon the mil dot fraud in conjunction with moving target training taught there (and everywhere else in the military), with the inevitable and logical consequences.

While everyone is blaming Horiuchi for deliberately shooting Vicki Weaver, the facts, given his training, are less dramatic. But the facts are a telling indictment against the competence of military instructors, both in respect to their craft, and their competence to train law enforcement.

In military sniper schools moving target engagement is taught using the mil-dot ambush method. This involves placing the crosshair on an aiming point a certain distance in front of the target, and guessing the time to shoot as the target moves along your mil-dot reticule. This parlor trick works fine in a school environment on a known distance range when the target is moving according to a rigidly enforced pace and the sniper student gets a number of "sighters" sufficient to refine his guess at what point to shoot. This allows the student "dope" the target-speed-of-the-day. When the target speed is thus *known*, the hit probability is about 85 percent at 200 yards against a walking body-width "E" silhouette target. In the real world, against human targets moving at random speeds, the hit probability against a running target at 200 yards is less than 15 percent.

This is how Mrs. Weaver got shot. Randy Weaver's friend, Kevin Harris, was running for the cabin. Horiuchi put his crosshair on the cabin door and concentrated on watching Mr. Harris run along the horizontal wire of his mil-dot reticule. When Horiuchi *guessed* Mr. Harris was at the "ambush point" he shot. The bullet went exactly where it was aimed—the door, where Mrs. Weaver was standing.

On 20 September, 1995, other FBI HRT snipers also took the 5th in testimony before the Senate hearings.

An SFU observer who has trained with HRT snipers put their refusal to testify in clear perspective. "The bottom line is that they are punks," he said. "They are bad-asses on a known distance range when they are shooting at quarters—after about 10 sighting shots to get their zero 're-fined.' But operationally they are losers."

Any law enforcement sniper who shoots at a moving target should reflect upon his lack of judgment in a prison cell. His cell mates should be the legally incompetent military instructors who taught him that a school house parlor trick was applicable in an operational setting.

Mooching

WE ARE reliably informed that MG William Garrison, CG, United States Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School, Fort Bragg, NC, is the recipient of a second-hand copy of *The RESISTER* within days of its public release. We must make it clear that MG Garrison is not a subscriber, nor, according to his public statements, is he a supporter. He simply receives a copy that is forwarded to him from sources unknown.

Apparently, MG Garrison keeps his copy on his desk for several days and reads it during his precious few leisure moments. One source claims that MG Garrison is searching for clues to the identity of SFU members. Another source speculates that he is reviewing *The RESISTER* for any content that may be violations of 18 USC 2385 and 2387. A third source believes MG Garrison is simply keeping tabs on something concerning his command. When MG Garrison is finished reading it, his bootleg copy is placed in the USAJFKSWCS Command Group "Resister" file. The Command Group has a complete set of back issues, thus anyone missing an issue can cruise on down to the Command Group at SWCS and make one. They have a copy machine right there (bring your own paper).

There is nothing particularly ominous about all this. In fact, MG Garrison seems to have developed a sense of humor. He was recently overheard

saying, "If you haven't been raked over the coals in *The RESISTER* you're nobody." Our only objection is that a Major General hauls in a hefty paycheck, therefore receiving a copy of *The RESISTER* from someone else is uncouth.

Come on Bill, just send us the \$20.00. It is unseemly for a man of your position and authority to be a mooch.

Gag Order

ON 14 SEPTEMBER, 1995, LTG Scott, CG, USASOC, issued a verbal order to all Special Forces Groups that no Special Forces soldier was to talk to *Army Times* reporters without his personal permission, and then only in the presence of the USASOC PAO and JAG. This order was given with no context but anybody who does not get their news from the red media knows why: SPC Michael New.

Note that LTG Scott's order specified only Special Forces, and not the pretenders in the Ranger light infantry or the social workers in PSYOPS and CA. The true intent of LTG Scott's order was to head-off the possibility of the *Army Times* accidentally asking Special Forces Underground members, or sympathizers, what they thought about serving under UN command.

Look here, Jim: in addition to your oath to "...defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic...", you also took an oath to "...never lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate those who do." Your order to your subordinates to not speak their minds when questioned is the equivalent of—if memory serves correct—quibbling. Quibbling is itself a lie. You cannot prevent people from thinking by ordering them to not talk.

SFARTEC Restricted

RECENTLY, LTG Scott issued a policy statement concerning the conduct of instructors of the Special Forces Advanced Reconnaissance and Target Exploitation Course (SFARTEC), who have been

conducting "off-the-books" training for the Washington DC FBI Metro Office, among others. LTG Scott directed that SFARTEC (Co. D, 2nd Bn, 1st Special Warfare Training Group (Abn)) will no longer have any contact with civilian law enforcement agencies. To reinforce his new policy, LTG Scott had his JAG drop by to drive home the point. LTG Scott further directed that if any non-military agency wanted to use the SFARTEC apparatus or other facilities at Range 37 their request must first pass through, and be approved by, LTG Scott's office.

Bravo, Jim!

SFOD-D Cool Guys and HRT Losers

IN THE last issue I reported on the questionable relationship between the U.S. military and "law" enforcement agencies. Continuing my coverage of the FBI's Hostage Rescue Team (HRT) in this report:

Law enforcement sources report on a "very special" training relationship between the FBI HRT and the US Army's SFOD-D. Last year, three members of Delta were at the FBI Academy in Quantico, VA. Although they *tried* to live their cover as FBI agents (I have always been amazed that the FBI refers to their officers in the same terms intelligence officers refer to their sources), the Delta logo on their tie clasps, wrist watches and money clips gave them away. It seems the Delta guys were there as "advisors" to the HRT. It has also come to my attention that HRT often utilizes the Delta training facilities at Range 19 and the shooting house at Wally World with Delta instructors. With all the training and cool-guy equipment recommended by SFOD-D you would think the HRT is ready to deal with all the hostage barricade situations conducted by international terrorists on American soil (sarcasm).

Lacking this chance to excel, a mere stroke of the pen can send the "Hostage Rescue Team" to Ruby Ridge, where they don't remember hearing about any hostages being involved. What's in a name? Try getting appropriations for something

called the "FBI Paramilitary Assault Force."

I wouldn't object so much to the HRT if it would have meant the disbanding of all those black suited, nylon holstered assault cowboys that nearly every other unconstitutional federal agency has glued together out of cool-guy-stuff catalogs. Although the FBI is catching all this heat, don't forget that it was an ad hoc mob of enthusiastic amateurs that attacked Waco.

J.H. Ross

Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) for the CY95 SFC/ANCOC Selection Board (Minority and Female Noncommissioned Officers)

TRANSLATING Army weaselspeak into understandable English is a crushing task under normal conditions, and almost impossible when a meaningless bromide like "equal opportunity" is the subject. The topic of promotion boards and their politically correct biases is at best controversial, and at worse, subject to (usually well founded) bitter cynicism. Here is why:

"The goal of this board is to achieve a percentage of selection for all gender and race/ethnic categories in each MOS comparable to the percent considered for all gender and race/ethnic categories in each MOS. This goal is important because, to the extent that each board achieves it, the Army at large will have a clear *perception* (emphasis added) of equal opportunity.... This goal will not be interpreted by the board as guidance for it to meet any "quota."

"Prior to recess, the board must review and report the extent to which minority and female noncommissioned officers were selected at a rate less than non-minority noncommissioned officers. Although the board may have met the overall goals for minorities and women, it will identify any situation in which a particular minority-gender grouping did not fare well in comparison to the overall population. Explain such situations fully in the after-action report.

Our team of Weasel linguists labored for days translating the above, but finally managed to reduce two paragraphs of bullshit into 3 monosyllabic sentences:

Weasel - English translation:
"There is a quota. You will meet it. We will not tell you what it is."

Thus do attempts to give specific instructions on how to put into practice floating abstractions reveal the true intent behind "equal opportunity," and exposes the party line that promotions are based "solely on merit" for the lie it is.

Shut-Up You!

DURING the House Waco hearings, MAJ Mark Petrie was present as a witness to testify as to the role played by himself and ODA 381, Co.B, 3d Bn, 3d SFGA, (under his command when he was company commander of Co.C, 3/3 SFGA) in the training of ATF at Fort Hood, Texas, during the week leading up to the assault on the Branch Davidians at Waco, TX. We note parenthetically that CPT Clyde Moore, Detachment Commander, ODA 381 at that time, was conspicuously absent from the hearings.

Several USASOC and USASFCA observers have reported that one week prior to their appearance before the committee the enlisted soldiers who were called to testify were rigorously "pre-briefed" and rehearsed by MG Tangney and the USASOC JAG on what was, and was not, permissible testimony. Again, CPT Moore was not present (but he was present for duty as EUCOM Desk Officer at USASFCA). This corresponds to reports from observers within the Department of the Army that they were ordered by Togo West to "stone-wall" congressional investigators requesting documents related to Waco. (And we all know who Togo receives his orders from, don't we?) But we digress.

MAJ Petrie had a "watcher" from USASOC JAG sitting behind him throughout his testimony before the committee. The specific task of this watcher was to prod Petrie when he began saying just a little too much. (You can see this person sitting just

behind Petrie in tapes of the proceedings.) The reason this watcher lurked behind Petrie was because Petrie found absolutely nothing wrong with U.S. Army personnel being directly involved in murdering U.S. civilians and would have told the committee as much if the watcher hadn't been there to shut-him-up.

According to several sources, MAJ Petrie's only concern about accepting the mission to train the ATF assault force was, in his own words, "If this backfires it'll come back on us." In other words, he was perfectly willing to take credit for the mission if it worked; he just didn't want to be blamed if it did not. MAJ Petrie learned the art of avoiding responsibility for his actions after getting one of his soldiers killed during the Panama invasion.

On 03 March 1993, Petrie gathered his company around him at McGregor Range Complex, Ft. Bliss, Texas, to tell them what a "black day for law enforcement" Waco was, and that they should grieve for "all the friends we lost there." Observers report he was pretty upset about comments he heard in the mess hall that ATF had it coming, and that any fool could see Koresh should have seized the initiative and counterattacked. On the bright side, observers report his "motivation speech" was met with stony silence from the troops.

This still begs the question, "Where was Clyde?" After all, it was his mission. Maybe he didn't make it past Tangney's pre-brief. Big gamble on DA's part. Too bad no one called the bluff.

And why didn't the committee ask MG Pickler about GEN Colin Powell's visit to JTF-Six on 05 March, 1993? Perhaps it would have been the embarrassment of presidential hopeful Powell's authorization to release armored vehicles to the feds following Waco, but not to his own soldiers in Mogadishu, Somalia.

Reducing the Threat

FOR THE benefit of anyone not paying particular attention, the Department of Defense has been systematically redesignating National Guard combat units as com-

bat support and combat service support units. 50,000 National Guard combat soldiers are to be cut from the force structure and a further 60,000 combat troops are to be moved to support units, or redesignated as support personnel. Seven National Guard infantry divisions, and one armored division, are to retire their colors during FY96.

All this of course is touted by some female Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs calling herself Deborah Lee as "...part of the solution...."

What solution is that, Debbie? Reducing the threat that the states might actually resist a complete federal take-over? Nonetheless, thanks for tossing 50,000 trained (and now unfederalized) infantrymen into our laps.

Creative Financing

WHEN FOB 33 (-), commanded by LTC David Schroer, deployed to Zimbabwe as Flintlock II theater command and control element for JCETs throughout Africa and Humanitarian De-mining missions in Namibia and Rwanda, they ran a Static-Line Jumpmaster Course at Manyami Airfield near Harare. Three courses were conducted between mid-August and late-September. Each of these three mission types, JCET, HDM, and Flintlock II, derived their funding from three different sources. JCETs were funded by DA. HDM missions were funded by the U.S. Department of State. Flintlock II was funded by JCS through European Command (EUCOM).

Anybody who knows anything about Resource Management and fund sites knows money from exclusively designated "pots of money" cannot be mixed. Anybody, that is, except LTC Schroer. In a well intentioned (but underhanded) effort to get as many of his soldiers SLJM qualified as possible, LTC Schroer had soldiers from his battalion "re-aligned" within the Theater from their authorized mission sites to Harare, Zimbabwe. Since the JCET funds appropriated for those missions

did not cover the cost of re-deploying soldiers within the Theater, LTC Schroer came up with a unique solution—he used Department of State HDM funds to fly his DA JCET funded soldiers to Zimbabwe on commercial flights.

So what? He knew he was doing wrong because, at one point, he had a fax sent to AOB 38 in Rwanda, from Zimbabwe, directing that the State Department HDM fund site be used to re-deploy soldiers funded under JCET money to Zimbabwe, and specifically requested that LTC Thomas Odom, DAO, AMEMBASSY Kigali (who works for the State Department), not be shown the fax. Unfortunately for LTC Schroer, LTC Odom was standing in front of the fax machine when his message arrived in Kigali. But that is not all.

Part of the State Department funding package for the HDM missions was the purchase of nine desktop computers pre-configured for HDM missions with a software package that includes state-of-the-art IMINT analysis, and a specially designed de-mining D-BASE program. Out of nine computers bought with de-min-

ing funds exactly one was deployed on one of two de-mining missions. The rest were distributed within LTC Schroer's command for the administrative "plus-up" of ADP equipment. In other words, the computers remained at Ft. Bragg and were used for everything except de-mining.

Just to complete the historical record, LTC Schroer is famous for "constructive" budget management. When he was Executive Officer of 3d SFG(A), (and therefore responsible for managing the Group budget), he "gated" 30% of all JCET budgets to finance end of Fiscal Year equipment purchases for 3d SFG(A) generally. He did this with the concurrence and approval of former 3d SFG(A) commander BG Phillip Kensinger.

There are definitions for all this: misappropriation of funds; conversion of property; fraud.



THE RESISTER is now OFFICIALLY on-line in ASCII

IN AN exclusive contractual agreement with the publisher of *The RESISTER*, I BBS of Minneapolis MN carries the only certified, PGP signed by *The RESISTER*, true and accurate text version of *The RESISTER* available anywhere. **Trust no others.** Text versions can be downloaded or read on-line at an annual subscription rate of \$20 for 4 issues, \$6 for the current issue, or \$7 per back issue. One-year subscription includes e-mail to *The RESISTER*. *The RESISTER* PGP pubkey (includes e-mail address) will be sent via I BBS e-mail upon receipt of payment at I BBS PO Box. No personal information is required in order to receive ASCII versions of *The RESISTER*.

LOGON INSTRUCTIONS

The prompts to set up an account are self-explanatory. You may enter false information at the "real name" and "phone number" prompts. Leave e-mail at the "validation feedback" prompt stating that you saw this announcement. Place your order at that time, or type 'F' at the Main Menu to send e-mail to the I BBS administrator at a later time. Instructions for accessing ASCII versions of *The RESISTER* will be e-mailed on I BBS upon receipt of payment.

THE RESISTER in ASCII

Current Issue \$6.00
One Year(Four Issues) \$20.00
Back Issues(ea.) \$7.00

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____

ZIP _____

I BBS account # or password _____

I BBS ATTN: TR, PO Box 201741, Bloomington, MN 55420

612-885-0512 * 8/1/NONE * 14400 * 24 HRS * HERMES II

TERMS: Cash, or MO with "PAY TO THE ORDER OF" blank. Place your order on this form or in I BBS e-mail.

Correspondence

Continued from page 6

That is why, although you say that "the underground is not an organization that can be joined" I feel I already have. I am a member of the armed services (granted, not special forces) who finds himself dissatisfied with the status quo and looking to actively support a return to limited government and the championing of individual liberties.

Air Force Captain
Somewhere in the Mid-West

WITH reference to Vince Foster, accountability, and Hillary Clinton: PERINTREP on the White House shows Hillary Clinton leading Waco briefings beginning shortly after February 28, 1993 (*The Resister*, Vol. II, No. 1, p.7), as the "acknowledged, but unofficial, chairman." Foster's missing papers are identified as the minutes of these meetings. Foster's depression (widely reported), leading to Foster's suicide (widely debated), is attributed to his guilt over the disastrous Waco outcome.

The same PERINTREP noted seven White House officials attending the on-going briefings sessions, where Hillary developed the "Abused Children Strategy." Presumably the White House officials trusted Hillary's ideas and direction enough to go along with her, as that was the strategy adopted and implemented. As a matter of fact, the strategy turned out to be strong enough to provide motivation, explanation, as well as titillating distraction throughout the subsequent years of investigation, up to and including the July - August '95 House Hearing on Waco.

If Hillary Clinton, an unofficial member of the group, developed this strategy, she was "practicing on some one else's license," so to speak. Hubbell and Foster are credited with helping her "refine" the strategy.

With an enormous leap of good faith and charity, we could assume the eventual unfortunate gassing, shooting and burning of the children was an unexpected outcome of a public relations strategy designed to save the children as a plausible expla-

nation for attacking their home in the first place. David Koresh, speaking with the FBI negotiators, and Janet Reno, speaking for the White House, both claimed to care deeply about the children. No one with any power in the event cared enough about the children to save them. If the disastrous death toll was unexpected, Hillary, Foster, Hubbell and the others would not have been adequately prepared *emotionally* for the outcome.

Expected or not, as the enormity of the disaster began to be confirmed, we would expect to see members of the group bearing core responsibility begin to doubt themselves and attack each other.

By all accounts, Foster's personal involvement with Hillary was more developed than Hubbell's. Foster would not have been the first man in history to allow a woman access to power through his own office. Intellectually, the terrible outcome had to challenge Foster into a serious re-evaluation of his own choices. In the face of his professional and emotional ties, Foster had to either admit his own accountability for her actions or acknowledge publicly and/or privately his own inability to control her.

Foster faced a hell he did not survive.

J.L. Heber
Pembroke, NC

The militia is a venerable institution in the United States. The Constitution grants Congress the power to "organize, arm, and discipline" the militia, while reserving to the states the powers to "appoint the officers of the Militia" and the authority to "train the Militia" according to "the discipline prescribed by Congress." Notably, the Constitution also grants Congress the power to "raise and support armies" separate to the militia.

The Second Amendment to the Constitution speaks of the "right of the people" (to keep and bear arms) in the same sentence that refers to the militia. An examination of the written record of debates concerning the ratification of the Constitution shows that the militia was understood without exception to consist of the whole body of the people. More than 200 years of searching have not found a

single scrap of paper which supports the idea that the founders intended for the militia to be a "select militia" under control of the federal government.

Why does the Constitution provide not only for a militia, but also guarantee the right of the people to keep and bear arms? The Framers were not silent on this question. In Federalist Paper No. 29, Alexander Hamilton wrote in reference to "the proper establishment of the militia:"

"...but if circumstances should at any time oblige the government to form an army of any magnitude that army can never be formidable to the liberties of the people while there is a large body of citizens, little if at all inferior to them in discipline and the use of arms, who stand ready to defend their own rights and those of their fellow citizens."

In one breathtaking sentence, Hamilton informed us 1) who the militia is (the citizenry at large), 2) what type of arms and training the militia should possess (those enabling the militia to be "little if at all inferior" to the standing army, and 3) why the militia exists (to guard against government tyranny). Thus the militia is meant to be part of the checks and balances in our system of government; it is the ultimate safeguard against tyranny.

For the first time in 219 years, militia groups are now spontaneously organizing throughout this country. Should not the perceptive among us question why this is so? Should we not wonder why Congress has not only abdicated its responsibility to "organize, train, and discipline" the militia, but also is legislating against the militia? If the militias that have formed do not constitute a well regulated militia, who is to blame? What choices do the people have when the federal government not only abandons its responsibilities, but exceeds its lawful authority under the Constitution?

In these difficult and tumultuous times are we to trust our liberty and freedom to the empty rhetoric of professional politicians and the professional soldiers in their employ? Or should we be more disposed to trust the militia—a body composed of our friends, neighbors, and relatives, whose common interest is the preser-

vation and protection our common freedom?

David Deming
Norman, OK

THE Constitution of the United States was not written for the purpose of limiting the people's rights but as a limit on government power over the people. The rights mentioned in the first 10 amendments...are inalienable (*incapable of being alienated, surrendered, or transferred*). This includes our second amendment right to keep and bear arms.

The Virginia Declaration of Rights, June 12, 1776, was the first such statement of political liberty in America. It was copied by other states and served as the model for the federal Bill of Rights. In Title 44 of the Codes of Virginia, the militia is designated as everyone from the ages of 16 to 55 with a few exceptions, including postal workers and (holders of) some political offices. As Alexander Hamilton stated: "The militia is a voluntary force not associated or under control of the state except when called out, a permanent or long standing force would be entirely different in make-up and call."

No matter how good a system of government may be, it is still run by men. For this reason the Founding Fathers provided for the militia. Without an armed citizenry all our other rights would be subject to abuse. The abuse of power would come in the form of unconstitutional laws and regulations that violate our liberties. These unconstitutional laws would be enforced by federal law enforcement and military units. Thus, the citizen's militia serves as a check to federal tyranny, or the tyranny of any other government. This check, the militia, would be rendered useless if it needed approval from the above governments in order to be formed or operate.

Abuses by the ATF, IRS, the Executive Branch, and many other areas of our government can only inevitably lead to the further stripping away of our constitutional rights. It is our shame that the abuses have gone so far. It is to our charge to restore our constitutional form of government.

Douglas Jeffreys
Ashland, VA

ALTHOUGH I assume that this isn't your usual area of interest, I feel compelled to share some of my thoughts with you at the end of the OJ Simpson trial. I was disturbed by the role that race seemed to play in this media event. In the post verdict press conference by the defense counsel, Mr. Cochran stated, "It would be malpractice..." for a lawyer to not introduce race into this case.

My own political affiliations are irrelevant to this (although members of the hyphenated-society will believe whatever they are told to believe). I have documented evidence that my family came to this country from Europe in 1910. Logically, I thought that this excluded me from the category of "son of slave owners." Imagine my surprise to realize that the doctrine of Original Sin had been extended to the secular world, and I was branded an oppressor and racist at the moment of conception!

Early reports on the reading of the verdict indicated that one of the Negro jurors (coded as number 6) raised toward Mr. Simpson what was euphemistically referred to by Peter Jennings as "a symbol of unity." In my day, that gesture was known as the Black Power salute. Obviously the Revolutionary Communist Party is still alive and well in Los Angeles.

It's interesting to note that when a predominately Caucasian jury found Caucasian police officers "Not Guilty" in the Rodney King case, the street savages rioted. On the other hand, when a predominately Negro jury finds a Negro celebrity "Not Guilty" of murder, the same tribe sings the praises of how well the system works.

According to those close to Mr. Cochran, everything comes down to race for him. There is indeed a different set of standards when a racist (and stupid) LAPD detective is compared to Hitler and characterized as "the personification of evil," yet at the same time Mr. Cochran rubs elbows with the bow-tied *Sturmabteilung* of the vehemently racist Nation of Islam!

You were right Mr. Cochran; this is a racist nation. You, and irrationalists like you, are living proof.

An American Citizen
Atlanta, GA

Mail Call

As I mentioned last quarter, a handful of people are letting their desire for anonymity cloud their judgement about just how efficiently the U.S. Postal Service can find them. A small stack of undeliverable issues, still in their envelopes, sits awaiting a "Where the hell is my issue?" letter from elusive subscribers. The count to date is seven. The Zip Codes are: 03785, 24506, 33309, 64141, 95608, 29325 and 28307. If you want your issues, write. Include an address that works.

If your order gets mixed-up, or you think it's taking just a little too long, send us a letter explaining the problem. Include an evening phone number. We fix mistakes on the spot, then send corrections back down the rat-line. Please remember that a rat-line is not a bullet train.

We are still getting questions about whether or not our drop address is "covered" by the opposition. It is reasonable to assume it is. By law, a passive mail cover is permitted only to photocopy the exterior of the envelope. Information about you can be circumvented using our drop address as your return address. Another technique is to address your letter with a lay-out editor's non-reproducing-blue pen or pencil. These can be obtained at art stores. Using either technique, the only information the opposition gains is the Post Office from which the letter was mailed. If you are concerned about transparency sprays, wrap your correspondence in aluminum foil. There are still no indicators of an aggressive mail cover. Always include your mailing address with your correspondence. As always, if you want confirmation that we received your correspondence include a stamped, self-addressed postcard.

If you are submitting letters for publication, include instructions on how you want your material signed. Lacking specific instructions, the editor will use your name, city and state. Please include an evening phone number for verification.

Miss B
Security Clerk, SFU

Clinton A "Zombie Slave"?

by
Aida Parker¹

ONE OF Clinton's proudest boasts is that he "restored democracy" to Haiti—a starveling state that has never known democracy, least of all now. There are a few factual realities that neither Clinton nor the US left/lib press have seen fit to mention. *The Washington Inquirer's* A.B. Schreiber has recently visited Port-au-Prince. Here is his curious report:

IN this land where witch doctors carry more clout than conventional PhD's or professional campaign advisers, the average citizen is being given a mind-boggling explanation for why Bill Clinton so handily beat President George Bush in 1992. Acting on the advice of a *houngan*, or sorcerer, supplied by then-exiled President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, Clinton did not change his underwear for the last week of the campaign.

The same *houngan* also cast a "malediction" on Bush by manipulating a doll made in his image. The torment climaxed when the *houngan* caused Bush to vomit in the lap of the Japanese Prime Minister as the world press looked on, disgracing him with the public. These and other bizarre stories are being told to the Haitian people through *Lavalassien*, a newspaper published by Aristide's ruling party.

These stories are written by the Rev Gerard Jean-Juste, a priest in the president's entourage. The Rev Gerard also claims that Aristide now has a permanent grip on Clinton's psyche through the magic of voodoo. The appeal of and belief in voodoo and witchcraft in this largely illiterate nation cannot be overstated. Polls put the number of voodoo "believers" as high as 85%, even among the educated. *Houngans* are even more important in this Haitian capital than are psychiatrists in Washington.

Grotesque as they are, the stories about voodoo's role in the 1992 election—and of its claimed current influence on Clinton—are important because officials in Aristide's National Palace accept them matter-of-factly as true. They help explain why Aristide is able to keep an emotional grip on the Haitian masses, and why he felt he could repudiate promises to hold national elections in return for Clinton's help in regaining office.

The voodoo scenario is a classic example of how, in a Third World country, what the general public *accepts* as truth is often more important than the truth itself. As told in *Lavalassien* and in private conversations, Clinton staffers first got the idea of invoking voodoo during conversations with Aristide, then living in exile in Washington.

The aim was to learn what the future held for candidate Clinton, and to cast spells to help influence the election. In return for what Rev Gerard calls "a large sum of money," a *houngan* was retained by the Clinton campaign, to cast spells to help influence the election. A *wanga*, or malediction, was cast upon Bush to cause his defeat. Clinton, for his part, agreed to wear the same pair of underpants in the last week of the campaign—so the story goes.

Haitian officials are now saying that Clinton reaffirmed his faith in voodoo during his March 31 visit to the island, the purpose of which was to celebrate Aristide's supposed "return to democracy." Bringing Clinton under the spell of voodoo, they say, had two purposes: to render him impervious to the attacks of his republican enemies in Washington, and to guarantee his reelection.

The ceremony was said to have been hidden within a public event described as dedicating a monument to Haiti's boat people. The focal point was a "magic well" concealed inside a sculptor's rendition of a brick and concrete boat, recently constructed in the vicinity of Aristide's residence as Tabarre.

Aristide, it should be noted, earlier this year renounced the Catholic Church and said he was returning to the voodoo faith of his ancestors. The declaration,

Best Feds

Continued from page 1

Enter two *Soldier of Fortune* investigators, who had just run three weeks of surveillance on an ATF Special Operations Division facility in suburban Washington. The unmarked office handles the acquisition, record-keeping, maintenance, repair, modification, installation and distribution of ATF cellular telephones, radios, classified secure communications devices and covert electronic equipment. Observing employees throwing trash into the dumpster, the investigators sprung into action. All trash from the ATF office was snagged within minutes.

A story in the October *SOF* chronicles a rich haul: scores of phone messages, phone bills, shipping receipts, purchase orders and radio frequency zone maps for major U.S. operations; plus wiring diagrams and technical manuals for various devices. Also, travel orders for agents and family members, leave time applications, personal mail, checking account carbons, social security numbers, lists of home addresses and phone numbers of past and present personnel—with spouses names noted in parenthesis (family support rosters).

Lucky for the ATF these dumpster divers were journalists and not terrorists. The magazine also collected profile sheets with the names of agent's children, undercover radio call signs and operative's code names. If this wasn't bad enough, the reporters came up with blank ATF stationary, official postage-paid ATF envelopes and three copies of a detailed floor plan of the communications and electronics surveillance facility.

FBI involvement was prompted by dozens of classified documents detailing model STU-III secure telephone units assigned to various ATF agents, including serial numbers, the names and locations of agents, code names and PIN numbers. The info sheet on each STU-III unit was marked either secret or top secret.

James L. Pate, author of the *SOF* article confirmed to a *Resister* intermediary that the ATF's classified

Continued on page 29

Continued on page 26

ANALYSIS

"A" is "A"

by
Red Barchetta

MANY OF US have heard about Specialist Michael New, the medic with the 3rd Infantry Division in Germany who, at last word, was refusing to wear a blue helmet during a forthcoming U.N. "peacekeeping" mission in Bosnia. New cites a conflict with his oath to defend the Constitution and the illegal redirection of his loyalties from the sovereign United States to an international cabal of socialist nations hostile to the United States. Countering this, the army cites his refusal to follow orders as a conflict with being a soldier. Both arguments are at least partly correct, yet incompatible. This is illustrative of what happens when a soldier, a military, a nation, or a world do not accept the premise that "A" is "A," that a thing is itself and cannot be contrary to that.

For his part, Michael New is a brave and principled soldier willing to abide by the oath he swore to defend the Constitution. Michael New appears to be a man of his word. Nonetheless, his actions to date will only serve to silence him rather than advance his justifiable opinions. Consider that a soldier is one who fights, or is prepared to fight, under orders given by his commanders within a legally sanctioned army. (Thus, a soldier cannot be a "peacekeeper" even if peace is the result of his actions: he either fights or he becomes a target in soldier's clothing.) The basic terms of a soldier's employment is that he obeys any over-riding oath he takes and then all orders consistent with it.

Despite the existence of that hierarchy, when he is given orders that conflict with his oath, he is being forced to live a contradiction, to be simultaneously "A" and "Non-A," to be obedient to his oath and to that which conflicts with it. The more honorable the individual soldier, the more irreconcilable this conflict is. Until this conflict is resolved, he simply cannot be a soldier in any active capacity because soldiers function under command that induces action. Contradictions are anti-commands that induce paralysis.

And there is more: if a soldier violates his orders so as to obey his oath, he will lose his ability to act as a soldier because he will be discharged or imprisoned; if he violates his oath so as to obey his orders, he will lose his ability to *think* as a soldier because he will be forced to abandon the context that would otherwise guide his judgment. This severs his mind from his body, and just as a ghost (a disembodied mind) cannot be a soldier, neither can a zombie (a mindless body).

That the army and most of its civilian commanders want Specialist New to adopt the role of zombie is not only obvious, but is also what *The RESISTER* has been saying all along about the goal of current policy being to create an army of mindless obedient drones. Observe that an army of zombies cannot defend the United States, but most certainly can attack her. Now, consider the nature of current laws, directives, and values, which might guide the military as well as internal law enforcement to do just that.

The sad consequence of failing to accept that "A" is "A" is that one must then try to accept self-contradictions. If a thing is not what it is, then everything is simply indeterminate mush. Nothing is anything, and any particular thing is nothing. When the Army contends, and Michael New agrees, that a soldier has the obligation to obey one set of orders and disobey another, both sides are proclaiming that the actions which distinguish the career of "soldier" are amorphous, are without nature and context, are both "A" and "Non-A," and are ultimately nothing. (Consider that "peacekeepers" are supposed to fight and non-fight, and that in Vietnam, the U.S. was supposed to win and non-win.)

Any such heap of self-contradictory sludge negates context because there is

no context. It goes even deeper to negate the integration of one's principles because there is nothing to derive principles from or to apply them to. But a man is not a nothing, and his actions cannot be those of a ghost or of a zombie or of any other symbol of death. He is not a contradiction born out of indeterminate flux—he is something. He is an integration of mind and body, of thought and action, of oath and orders, of context and career.

Thus, a soldier may not disobey orders and still attempt to remain on active duty. Since he cannot be a contradiction, he cannot *live out* a contradiction. Similarly, if he believes the military he serves in is fully corrupt then he must not attempt to sanction that corruption with his participation in it, or his assistance to it. If he believes the military is partially corrupt, he must not attempt to corrupt it further by adding the chaos of insubordination and of his own contradictions.

In short, he cannot be a soldier and a non-soldier any more than he can be corrupt and non-corrupt. Any legal consequences he suffers as a result of such attempts must be accepted as a consequence of his own actions, because even if men try to permit contradictions, reality will not let them succeed.

When orders conflict, a soldier is not faced with the choice of which orders to obey; he is faced with the fact that he cannot morally or legally obey or disobey either set of orders. He simply cannot be a soldier under such conditions, and he cannot rationally be expected to act as a soldier. As bad as this is, it actually creates its own avenue of resistance that the honorable soldier can use.

While he cannot obey the better of his orders, he also cannot obey the worst. Since he is still a man who is under contract to the military, he cannot walk away in breach of that contract. What he can and must do is immediately cease all activity demanded by, and related to, both sets of orders while he relays the conflict up the chain of command until it is resolved. If the conflict is resolved—if his orders are now in harmony with his oath—he is a soldier again and therefore must follow those orders.

If the conflict is not resolved be-

cause the military is corrupt, although a soldier's oath may demand that he oppose such corruption, it does not provide him the tangible means by which to do so. Paralyzed by contradiction, he sees only two options: to obey his orders and commit the moral suicide of zombie-like action, or to obey his oath and commit the political suicide of ghost-like inaction. When someone unfit to command him refuses to admit that "A" is "A"—that the career of "soldier" is distinguished by a specific nature in a specific harmonious context—even the most honorable man is forced to choose the symbol of his own demise.

Bear in mind that if the soldier's commanders deliberately refuse to resolve their own contradictions, they actually have resolved them. By their own doing, his commanders have turned a self-contradiction into a simple conflict between a good (the Constitution), which is in harmony with that soldier's sworn oath, and an evil (the United Nations Charter), which is not. In the final analysis, they have given him his objective and his marching orders.

The soldier swears an oath to uphold non-corruption against corruption. The soldier's oath ultimately outweighs the whims of his commanders. If the soldier thinks properly in the non-contradictory context of the principles ultimately guiding him as a United States soldier, he will be able to see that he actually has a third choice.

In the event of this kind of willful corruption within the military—and in no other event—the honorable soldier's third choice is to resist any corrupt portions of the military. He may do this because they have (by their own contradictions) ordered him to, and he is honor bound to comply with his orders.

The purpose of this analysis is not to suggest how to resist. The intelligent soldier waging an honorable resistance can find ways to do so on his own (as any astute reader of *The RESISTER* knows). Rather, the purpose of this analysis is to show that "A" is still "A", that the soldier is still a soldier, and that armed with his duly sworn oath, his objective and his orders, he may act. It should be enough to say that in this context,

resistance is a consistent series of rationally justifiable actions designed to either trick the evil into serving the good, or to expose the evil and thereby attempt to nullify it outright.

This type of honorable, principled resistance re-joins the soldier's mind and his body. It gives him a way to obey his oath and his orders without being insubordinate to either. That allows him to neither commit moral nor political suicide, to neither acquiesce to evil nor be martyred at the hands of it, to neither become a zombie nor a ghost. It allows him to both live and live with himself. Such a resistance is more moral than acquiescence, more practical than martyrdom, more inspirational to the honorable, and more threatening to the dishonorable.



Treaties Define Fed Crime

Continued from page 1

interstate commerce, has been granted to the United States. There has been, however, no such grant of power over the fisheries. These remain under the exclusive control of the State...

Like fish, the Constitution simply grants no authority to the federal government to control the wildlife within the states of this nation and this is noted in several cases. A ready example of such a case is *United States v. Shauver*, 214 F. 154, 160 (E.D.Ark. 1914), which concerned the issue of where the Migratory Bird Act of March, 1913, could apply. Through this act, Congress sought to extend protection to migratory birds by limiting the hunting season and otherwise placing restrictions upon hunting of these birds. As is only natural, upon adoption of this act federal officials started strenuously enforcing it and here they had arrested Shauver in Arkansas for shooting and killing migratory birds. Shauver moved to dismiss the indictment filed against him on the grounds that the act contravened the Tenth Amendment by invading the jurisdiction of the states upon a matter historically reserved for legislation by the states. In deciding that this act was uncon-

stitutional, Judge Trieber noted that the common law provided that the states essentially owned the birds within their borders and state legislation was the sole source by which control of hunting could be accomplished. In so concluding, he held:

It is the people who alone can amend the Constitution to grant Congress the power to enact such legislation as they deem necessary. All the courts are authorized to do when the constitutionality of a legislative act is questioned is to determine whether Congress, under the Constitution as it is, possesses the power to enact the legislation in controversy; their power does not extend to the matter of expediency. If Congress has not the power, the duty of the court is to declare the act void. The court is unable to find any provision in the Constitution authorizing Congress, either expressly or by necessary implication, to protect or regulate the shooting of migratory wild game in a state, and is therefore forced to the conclusion that the act is unconstitutional.

Notwithstanding Judge Trieber's decision, enforcement of the act did not stop and it was thereafter enforced within Kansas, where another man was arrested for killing migratory birds. In *United States v. McCullagh*, 221 F. 288, 293 (D.Kan. 1915), the issue of the constitutionality of the Migratory Bird Act of 1913 was again before a different court and it, relying upon its own research of the law as well as the decision in *Shauver*, likewise concluded that this act was unconstitutional:

The exclusive title and power to control the taking and ultimate disposition of the wild game of this country resides in the state, to be parted with and exercised by the state for the common good of all the people of the state, as in its wisdom may seem best.

The above decisions have never been overruled and they stand today as valid authority for the proposition that Congress under the U.S. Constitution does not have any direct grant of power to regulate and control fish and wildlife within our country. If this is the case, you might ask what is

the constitutional basis upon which the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has been created and currently operates? The answer is treaties.

AS NOTED above in McCready, the Supreme Court held that Congress has no authority over fish within the states. The U.S. Fisheries Commission was created as the result of the ratification of a treaty or convention concerning this subject matter; see *Manchester v. Massachusetts*, 139 U.S. 240, 265, 11 S.Ct. 559, 565 (1891). Our country has ratified fishing treaties with other countries and native American Indian tribes for a long time; see these two old ones, the treaty with Great Britain regarding fisheries, adopted in 1818 (Revised Stat. 297), and the treaty with Russia regarding navigation and fishing in the Pacific Ocean, adopted in 1824 (Revised Stat. 664). Of course, we have many newer ones.

A similar route was taken to acquire Congressional control over migratory birds and wildlife. In 1916, the United States and Great Britain, on behalf of Canada, adopted the Migratory Bird Treaty (39 Stat. 1702) and thereafter Congress in 1918 passed another Migratory Bird Act to implement the provisions of the treaty. As this occurred, federal law enforcement officials again started to enforce the new act.

Within Arkansas in 1919, a man named Thompson was arrested for shooting these protected migratory birds and this case was assigned to the very same judge who had rendered the decision in *Shauver*; see *United States v. Thompson*, 258 F.257 (E.D.Ark. 1919). Here, Thompson raised the identical argument as *Shauver* which had previously proved successful in front of Judge Trieber. But, the federal prosecutor responded to this argument by noting the authority of this new treaty and this single change within the law dictated an entirely different result. In upholding the act and thus its application within the jurisdiction of Arkansas, Judge Trieber carefully analyzed the prior decisions rendered by the Supreme Court which illustrated the operation of treaties and how the same could abrogate state laws:

Law can only prescribe the conduct for the people within the jurisdiction of the lawmaker, *while treaties are to affect rights and privileges of subjects of foreign countries and of our citizens in such countries*. Treaties are reciprocal, and in all instances the same rights and privileges are granted to the citizens and subjects of each of the contracting parties in the respective countries... *Id.*, at 258. To subject the treaty power to all the limitations of Congress in enacting the laws for the regulations of internal affairs would in effect prevent the exercise of many of the most important governmental functions of this nation, in its intercourse and relations with foreign nations, and for the protection of our citizens in foreign countries. The states of the Union may enact all laws necessary for their local affairs, not prohibited by the national or their own Constitution; but they are expressly prohibited from entering into treaties, alliances, or confederations with other nations. If, therefore, the national government is also prohibited from exercising the treaty power, affecting matters which for internal purposes belong exclusively to the states, how can a citizen be protected in matters of that nature when they arise in foreign countries... *Id.*, at 263. Even in matters of a purely local nature, Congress, if the Constitution grants it plenary powers over the subject, *may exercise what is akin to the police power*, a power ordinarily reserved to the states... *Id.*, at 264.

Judge Trieber concluded that this treaty thus provided Congress with a power of municipal legislation and that treaty and its implementing act plainly operated within the state of Arkansas. A different case originating within Missouri, *United States v. Samples*, 258 F. 479 (W.D.Mo. 1919), ultimately made it to the U.S. Supreme Court where an identical conclusion was reached; see *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, 434, 40 S.Ct. 382, 384 (1920), which stated, "No doubt the great body of private relations usually fall within the control of the State, but a treaty may

override its power." See also *United States v. Selkirk*, 258 F. 775 (S.D. Tex. 1919); *United States v. Rockefeller*, 260 F. 346 (D. Mon. 1919); and *United States v. Lumpkin*, 276 F. 580 (N.D. Cal. 1921).

Thus for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, its constitutional authority arises from treaties.² After the adoption of several fishing treaties and conventions, Congress created the U.S. Fisheries Commission; see 16 Stat. 594. When the migratory bird treaties were ratified, this agency apparently acquired authority over migratory birds. Later, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna & Flora was adopted by the U.S. Senate on August 3, 1973; see 27 U.S.T. 1087. As a result of this treaty, on December 28, 1973, Congress enacted the "Endangered Species Act," 87 Stat. 884. Several cases have noted that the authority to regulate and control endangered species arises from this treaty; see *Palila v. Hawaii Dept. of Land & Natural Resources*, 471 F.Supp 985 (D. Haw. 1979); *Utah v. Marsh*, 740 F.2d 799 (10th Cir. 1984); and *Leslie Salt Co. v. United States*, 896 F.2d 354 (9th Cir. 1990). The wetlands convention was ratified in 1986 and on November 10, 1986, Congress adopted the "Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986," 100 Stat. 3582. It is clear that the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service's authority arises from these treaties and this agency thus has an "international" jurisdiction.

There are other examples of treaties being used to provide federal jurisdiction. Of course, Congress completely lacks delegated authority to control prostitution within the states. However, the Agreement for Repression of Trade in White Women was ratified by the Senate on March 1, 1905; see 35 Stat. 1979. The implementing legislation for this treaty was the White Slave Traffic Act, 36 Stat. 825. The Supreme Court has noted that this treaty provides jurisdiction to enact laws on this subject; see *United States v. Portale*, 235 U.S. 27, 35 S.Ct. 1 (1914). But, even with jurisdiction being founded upon this treaty, there are limits to prosecutions for violations thereof and everything relating to prostitution cannot be

controlled; see *Keller v. United States*, 213 U.S. 138, 29 S.Ct. 470 (1909). Like prostitution, congressional control over obscene publications arises from treaties; see Agreement on Obscene Publications, ratified on January 13, 1911 (37 Stat. 1511), and the implementing laws at 35 Stat. 1129 (March 4, 1909), and 36 Stat. 1339 (March 4, 1911), which are currently codified at 18 U.S.C. §1461. Treaty based federal criminal laws have their origin in the congressional authority to punish crimes against the laws of nations; see Art. 1, § 8 of the U.S. Constitution.³ The federal police power is therefore, for the most part, based on treaties.

The U.S. Constitution does not grant power to Congress to control air traffic or telecommunications. After the Wright brothers starting flying at Kitty Hawk, air traffic achieved a phenomenal growth, resulting in the adoption of several treaties on this subject. The Commercial Aviation Convention was adopted by the U.S. Senate on February 20, 1928; see 47 Stat. 1901. Later, the International Civil Aviation Treaty was adopted on December 7, 1944; see 61 Stat. 1180. Both of these treaties substantially covered all aspects of aviation, setting up precisely what we see today in American airports, many of which are controlled by the federal government. To implement the first treaty, Congress enacted The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, 52 Stat. 973, which created the F.A.A. When the federal government started funding Hartsfield Airport in Atlanta, its name was changed to Hartsfield International. Yet we do have some airports which have never been controlled by the federal government such as Houston's Hobby Airport which is governed by the city of Houston; for this reason, its name has not been changed to Hobby International. For telecommunications, the International Radio Convention, 45 Stat. 2760, was adopted by the U.S. Senate on March 21, 1928, and a second International Radio Convention, 49 Stat. 2392, followed thereafter on December 9, 1932. On June 19, 1934, Congress adopted the Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1064, which created the Federal Communications Commission. Thus, both the F.A.A. and F.C.C. are treaty

based, federal agencies which implement treaties our nation has ratified with other countries and therefore they have an international jurisdiction.

The U.S. Constitution does not grant authority to Congress to control trademarks within the states and the Supreme Court has so held. In *United States v. Steffens* (The Trade-Mark Cases), 100 U.S. 82 (1879), the Court dismissed some indictments which charged crimes of infringement of certain registered trademarks. As a result of this decision, a variety of treaties covering this subject were adopted thereafter, and some of the more noteworthy were adopted early in this century; see Pan American Trademark Convention, 44 Stat. 2494, ratified on January 12, 1927, and Pan American Convention for Uniformity of Nomenclature for Classification of Merchandise, 44 Stat. 2559, ratified on January 12, 1927. It is these treaties which provide jurisdiction for the federal government over this subject matter. If Congress lacks power over trademarks except via treaties, it logically follows that Congress does not have any control over the similar and constitutionally indistinguishable activity of labeling of products except through treaties; yet labeling is an activity of great interest for the F.D.A.

CONTROL over the possession and sale of any item within the states is not a power possessed by Congress. This was so held in *United States v. DeWitt*, 76 U.S. (9 Wall.) 41, 45 (1870), which tested the constitutionality of a federal revenue act making it illegal to sell illuminating oil of a certain flammability. Here, the Court held that Congress did not have such power:

As a police regulation, relating exclusively to the internal trade of the States, it can only have effect where the legislative authority of Congress excludes, territorially, all state legislation, as, for example, in the District of Columbia. Within state limits, it can have no constitutional operation.

Based upon the decision in *DeWitt*, the Supreme Court held in *Unit-*

ed States v. Jin Fuey Moy, 241 U.S. 394, 36 S.Ct. 658 (1916), that Congress did not have the power to make penal mere possession of drugs within the states.

In 1912, the Senate adopted the International Opium Convention; see 38 Stat. 1912. Some years later, this convention was supplemented by a similar convention of 1931, the Multilateral Narcotics Drugs Convention, ratified on March 31, 1932, 48 Stat. 1543, which was thereafter implemented by appropriate federal legislation designed to control the production of poppy within this country. In *Stutz v. Bureau of Narcotics*, 56 F.Supp. 810, 813 (N.D.Cal. 1944), some poppy growers sought an injunction to the enforcement against them of the provisions of the act implementing the convention, their argument being that the act invaded the reserved powers of the states in contravention of the Tenth Amendment. In rejecting such argument and holding that the act applied within the jurisdiction of California, the court declared:

The competency of the United States to enter into treaty stipulations with foreign powers designed to establish, through appropriate legislation, an internationally effective system of control over the production and distribution of habit forming drugs is not questioned. The obligations of the United States incurred as a party to the two Conventions heretofore mentioned were lawfully undertaken in the proper exercise of its treaty making power. And Congress is constitutionally empowered to enact whatever legislation is necessary and proper for carrying into execution the treaty making power of the United States.

Other cases have also noted that control over drugs by the federal government arises from these treaties; see *United States v. Rodriguez-Camacho*, 468 F.2d 1220 (9th Cir. 1972); and *NORML v. Ingersoll*, 497 F.2d 654 (D.C.Cir. 1974), later opinion at 559 F.2d 735 (D.C.Cir. 1977). The jurisdiction of the D.E.A. is therefore based upon these drug treaties and it thus only has an international jurisdiction.

The above analysis of various decisions relating to the powers of Con-

Continued on page 21

RESISTANCE

Principles of Money Laundering

by

Stephan Girard

RMO, Special Forces Underground

MONEY laundering is simply the act of bringing unreported money into a person's or organization's recorded (or unrecorded) account by diverting it through legitimate business fronts. Financial crimes investigators classify laundered money into four types; black money, grey money, white money, and subterranean money.

Black money is money obtained by criminal means, such as kidnapping, bribery, fraud, tax evasion, theft, smuggling, trafficking in illegal commodities (such as drugs), and armaments dealing.

Gray money is money that the owner does not want known to be in his possession, even though it may not have been illegally obtained. Tax avoidance is legal if obtained through a "loophole" that the government has overlooked. A loophole has value only until it is used to such a degree that attention is focused on it. Then the government usually changes regulations so that the loophole can no longer be used. Thus the person or institution using the tax avoidance scheme may want to prevent having his legal tax avoidance system come to the attention of the government.

As another example of grey money, a person may have a business which is exceedingly profitable, and may want to conceal his prosperity to avoid attracting attention which could cause increased competition. Or a man who may not want his wife, or partners, or relatives to know he has made or obtained a large amount of funds.

The third type of money is clean, ordinary money—the type most of us obtain in small quantities at rare intervals by hard work, investment, or inheritance. However, some people get clean money by laundering black or grey money.

The fourth and last type of money is that obtained through the "subterranean," or underground, economy. It has been estimated that in the United States alone, this economy is worth at least \$500 billion per year, in both legal and illegal money, depending on the circumstances. Basically, it is like the ancient bartering system. A barber cuts his dentist's hair free, and the dentist gives him free dental services. But the phenomenal amount of this unreported money indicates a substantial portion may be illegal.

The difficulty of money laundering depends on the amount to be laundered, the place of laundering, and the sophistication of the procedure used. The simplest method in many countries is to take a risk and use the local banking system. However, this is difficult in the United States because of the reporting required. It is generally not difficult to change the respectability of currency.

There are three principle means of laundering money. The bank method, the tax haven method, and the black market method. The last is the simplest in many countries. Every country has a parallel money rate, variously called the free market, inland, or black market rate. The cost of changing currency in most

countries is about 10 percent, but in countries with strong currency, it may only be 2 or 3 percent.

In practice, the black market method works this way. Assume a person has "black" money in a given country, say, New Zealand. He can take it to the black market and change it for another currency such as U.S. dollars, at the black market rate of about 5 percent. This money, now in U.S. dollars, can officially be sent back to the country in which the switch was made. The black money has been made white.

In countries with no exchange controls, money need not go through the black market. It can be changed at the official rate at any bank, without records. The system of using the parallel market involves two countries, but it is safe as long as the person is not caught dealing with the black market money changer.

The bank method of legitimizing black or grey money is perhaps the most commonly practiced method in the United States. A drug trafficker, for example, instigates the changing of money through the banking system thus: A bag of soggy bills collected from street sales is taken to the neighborhood bank and changed to reputable financial instruments such as T-Bills, Letters of Credit, large denomination traveler's checks, real estate deeds, or bank drafts, thus becoming "clean." Up until 1980, this was reasonably easy to carry out in the United States.

In 1979, proposed amendments were considered by the Treasury Department, and a new Bank Reporting Ruling went into effect in July 1980. The ruling is too complex to report in full, but its main thrust was to amend the Bank Secrecy Act which requires financial institutions to report uninsured currency transactions in excess of \$10,000. Specific forms provided by the Secretary of Treasury must be used for reporting purposes.

In sum, every currency transaction over \$10,000 has to be reported, with positive identification of the person making the transaction (including name, address, Social Security number if a U.S. citizen, or passport number if alien, and various other details). The new regulation made it most difficult for any one person to make a currency transaction of more

than \$10,000 without a complete disclosure to the government.

The tax haven method is probably the most important of all. When World War II ended in 1945, there were approximately 55 countries in the world. Today there are just under 200. Every fragment of a major country seems to want independence. Once they have independence they usually find that their costs of operating greatly increase. However, all of the costs cannot be supported by inward cash flow. The new countries usually give up agriculture, and everyone moves to the city, where there is electricity and television. For a while they "borrow their way to success" from overseas banks. But when their credit lines are exhausted, they eventually scratch at any source of income. One ever-present possibility is to operate as a tax haven—a conduit for tax evasion money, tax avoidance money, or black market derived from crime.

MONEY goes around the planet earth 24 hours a day in search of vacuums. "Hot money" seeks out the cool areas of survival, including what the Germans call *Eine Steveroase* (a tax oasis) and the French call *un paradis fiscal* (a financial paradise). Tax havens are refuges from death duties and high taxes. The oldest and best known tax havens are the Cayman Islands, the Bahamas, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands Antilles, Monaco, Macao, Hong Kong, and Luxembourg. However, so many new havens are being created—e.g., the New Hebrides, Andorra, the Caicos, and Turk Island—that policing them for infractions is all but impossible. The new nations of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshalls and numerous other newly spawned nations in Africa, Asia and Europe will undoubtedly play an important role in money laundering.

Take the case of Nauru as an example. It is an independent nation, 8 square miles in size. It is a member of the United Nations and a British Commonwealth. It has no taxes of any kind, no tax treaties, and no exchange controls; commercial transactions may be carried out in any currency. The country prohibits immigration. Government almost never

grants tourist visas, and it certainly does not grant tax investigation visas. A visa would be virtually impossible for an IRS or any other tax investigator to obtain. The government is sound and stable. The people of Nauru have a standard of living 50 percent higher than that of the average American citizen. There is no political unrest. English is the official language. Nauru has modern companies and trust laws, and the law draws on British traditions. It is the smallest nation in the world with a president, elected parliament, and a well-developed civil service. It has its own highly efficient airline which flies to 20 or more countries.

A holding company can be set up in Nauru with as few as one and not more than 20 shareholders. The holding company has remarkable powers. It can operate without an annual meeting, and there is extraordinary freedom in relation to its shares. It need not have an auditor. Books can be kept outside Nauru's jurisdiction. A company is effectively established by sending in a form issued by the government. The annual corporation fee is as low as \$150.00 (naturally, the cost varies with the number and complexity of services required).

Commercial transactions or money can be routed through Nauru. The structure of Nauru's corporation act makes it easy for U.S. companies to form Nauruan holding corporations and manage them as wholly owned corporate subsidiaries without the necessity of setting up a "board of directors" as is required in many countries. The laws of the country have a statutory bar against any disclosure. An overseas company can easily and cheaply form a holding company which can do almost any conceivable commercial transaction such as being an intermediary in money legitimization, tax avoidance, profit stripping, re-invoicing to skim profits and take them tax-free, or do almost anything that does not represent fraud or a legal breach in Nauru (the transaction can breach laws of other countries, but Nauru does not set itself up as the world's policeman). The government has made positive efforts to welcome offshore investors and offers Nauru as a secretive tax haven, superior to those that suffer political unrest and upheaval.

It is not difficult to see how this serves those who have a need to transform black currency into white currency at a low cost, with complete secrecy. It is nearly impossible to prosecute someone through tracing finances if that person is sophisticated and knows how to use tax havens.

U.S. federal law requires that any transfer of over \$5,000 out of the United States must be reported to the treasury. This, however, does not apply to inter-bank transfers. Therefore, anyone moving large amounts of cash have to set up their own banks. These are usually one-room operations in places like St. Vincent, Anguilla, or the Cayman Islands. The cost of a banking charter and license in the Cayman Islands is \$6,500 in total. The bank can be "owned" by a Cayman management service company, and the beneficiary owner need never be known to any investigator. In Anguilla, no paid-up capital or reserves are required. Anguillian law states that a bank's license and charter can be sold *without* government approval.

Some bank haven countries even offer bank charters and licenses for as little as \$60.00. The low cost of owning an offshore bank makes it quite easy to transfer huge sums of money, with no reporting to anyone, and the cash filters through the bank as a conduit. It can be returned to the United States, pure as the driven snow, as a loan or any other similar way, or it can be placed in a secret account elsewhere.

Another ruse is the use of bearer bonds. These are not registered in anyone's name—they belong to whoever holds them. A person who wants to hide his money can buy municipal bonds and store them with his broker (unlike T-bills). The broker keeps them separately in a special account for each customer. The only place where a name is registered is at the brokerage house, which keeps the name only of the original buyer and the holder at the time of sale. It does not record intermediate sales. A lot of people use this system to keep their money possessions secret.

Tax-free municipal bonds are also used. The *Wall Street Journal* lists these and their interest rates. They are usually in bearer form, and interest is paid by redeeming coupons.

They are available only through brokerage houses. The broker keeps the name of the original purchaser, but intermediate sellers and buyers are not registered. These bonds may purchased with cash or otherwise, through a third party. Millions of dollars of unreported assets and income can be accumulated this way.

THERE are numerous other methods of laundering money. For example, insurance agents can accept deposits in any amount, and no bank reports are necessary. Examples laundering money through insurance companies include:

1) *The overseas "Umbrella life policy."* An overseas insurance company (usually in the United Kingdom, Jersey, Switzerland, Hong Kong, or Australia) sells a life insurance policy in the United States. (They are even sold by direct mail or telephone solicitation.) These overseas companies have devised an "umbrella policy" which includes not only life insurance, but also investments. For example a \$300,000 policy may have \$100,000 in full life insurance, and \$200,000 in currencies, stocks, bonds, T-bills, or other investments. The policy is classified by the United States as insurance, even though it is only partially insurance. It is usually single payment, the total cost for life is paid up at the time the policy is taken out. The cost may be \$60,000 or more, depending on the makeup of the policy, for a \$300,000 policy.

The advantage of this type of policy to a normal customer is that when the insured dies, his heirs get the full value (investments and all) tax free. If the investment part was separate and not packaged with the insurance, the heirs would have to pay death duties.

If a policy holder wants to cash in the policy before death, say in five years, he pays only capital gains on his earnings.

2) *"Borrowing" against a life insurance policy.* A money launderer buys a policy from a company. He can pay the agent in any way he wants, perhaps even with bags of soggy bills. Unlike banks, the insurance agent does not have to report cash transactions over \$10,000. The money is received by the agent, who finds ways to get it to the parent company. The money launderer then borrows up to

90 percent of the value of his policy, and the money is sent to him wherever he desires. The U.S. government is quite accustomed to loans from insurance companies to policyholders. The borrower pays no tax on a loan. It is all legal, and the \$300,000 (or whatever the sum) has been returned to the laundry man with no tax, and only a small service charge, quite proper. The IRS has no objection showing a loan from an insurance company.

Contrary to popular belief, the 1980 reporting regulations (Section 103.22 of part 103 of Title 21, code of Federal Regulations) did not make money laundering impossible. The 1980 Treasury Department Regulations have produced only two results: 1) money laundering was temporarily retarded while people found more sophisticated systems of circumventing the regulations; 2) it is now more difficult, more costly, and more important to launder money. The amount of money laundering may even have increased because laws make it imperative to launder black and grey money.

The 1980 regulations did not stop money laundering for a variety of reasons. Federal regulations do not restrict banks or other financial institutions from accepting or transferring cash. It only requires financial institutions to "report within 15 days all unusual deposits or withdrawals or other transactions, the name and address, the account number, social security or taxpayer number (if any), or in the cases of aliens a passport or identification document (unless the person or institution is exempt) and only in cases of over \$10,000 transactions."

Exempt from this regulation are U.S. residents who operate retail stores which deal in a "substantial amount" of currency. Exempt also are U.S. residents who operate amusement parks, bars, restaurants, sports arenas, racetracks, grocery markets, hotels, licensed check cashing services, or theaters. For example, one could own 3 different bars in 3 different cities, use several banks in each city, and make cash deposits of tens-of-thousands of dollars per day with no reports filed by the banks, and without breaking the regulations.

Exempt also are withdrawals of

cash for payroll purposes. Finally, transactions between domestic commercial banks or home loan banks are exempt as are transactions between nonbank financial institutions and commercial banks.

Because currency transactions involving less than \$10,000 do not have to be reported, one can deposit or "legalize to other forms of money" any amount as long as it is divided up—for example, he can launder \$24,000 by three \$8,000 deposits in three banks or branches.



Treaties Define Fed Crime

Continued from page 18

gress shows that it does not have the inherent authority to regulate or control either drugs or labeling, and that the only way federal jurisdiction could be acquired over these activities within the jurisdiction of the states would be by means of treaties. If the jurisdiction of the F.D.A. was truly treaty based, one would expect that its criminal enforcement powers would be exercised only at the borders of this country. In fact, this is the case for the F.D.A. because the only description of the authority of the F.D.A. district director is found at 21 C.F.R., §1.83, which provides as follows:

The term 'district director' means the director of the district of the Food and Drug Administration having jurisdiction over the port of entry through which an article is imported or offered for import...

This C.F.R. statement constitutes an admission: see *United States v. Van Griffin*, 874 F.2d 634, 638 (9th Cir. 1989)(government manuals admissible as party admissions under Fed.R.Evid. 801(d)(2)(D)). As you might expect, the authority of the F.D.A. arises from a 1906 international agreement, the Agreement for Unification of Pharmacopoeial Formulas for Potent Drugs.

Thus, it is very clear that federal agencies such as the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the FAA, the FCC, the DEA and the FDA have jurisdictions premised upon treaties and they

Continued on page 25

POLITICAL INTELLIGENCE

It is Forbidden to Identify a Communist!

by
"Buck-Slip"

THIS HAS BEEN the iron rule of liberalism—not communism. Where reds govern, they are not shy about proclaiming their affiliation, and where they don't govern, they are not strong enough to enforce such a rule on the general populace. But their allies, the American liberals, are that strong. They can and do enforce that rule.

Why? Simply so that their allies, the communists, can do their work without inconvenience. Suppose a Hollywood communist screenwriter is creating a communist propaganda film. If the public knows it is a communist production, they might not pay to see it. But liberals, who agree with the communist message, never want that to happen.

The communist message, just like the liberal message, is always wrapped in feel-good words like equality, democracy, peace and justice. The communist objective, like the liberal objective, is the takeover, weakening, and ultimate destruction of America. It becomes clearer by the day that "anything that weakens America is supported by the liberals."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt knew, definitely by 1939, of the treachery of Alger Hiss, but he had no objection to a Stalinist spy high in the Department of State. Or to Henry Dexter White in Treasury, or to the rest of them in Agriculture, or to his own personal aide, Harry Hopkins, or to his wife Eleanor's dalliances with a fortyish communist "youth leader," or to an essentially communist Vice President, Henry Wallace. (Wallace toured the Siberian *gulag* and his communist ghost-writer ran on and on about the happy peasants dancing on the village green. Now, nobody is that dumb!) In fact, Wallace's 1948 Presidential campaign was backed by, and received considerable funding through—from the COMINTERN—the Communist Party United States of America.

Hopkins and Hiss shipped secret documents to Stalin, as well as some essentials of the atomic bomb, via the air base in Great Falls, Montana, which was used to ferry aircraft to the Soviet Union. Robert Oppenheimer, with strong and well-known communist affiliations, was given the run of Los Alamos. Liberals to this day will protest the innocence of Oppenheimer and even Hiss.

Alger Hiss did much to "deliver" whole European countries to Stalin. Not satisfied with that, Hiss attempted to deliver the world to Stalin. Hiss was instrumental in the establishment of the United Nations, the "constitution" of which is based on the Constitution of the Stalinist Soviet Union.

When the stories began tumbling out, on Harry Truman's watch, he feared for the entire structure of the Democratic Party. That Party was not alone. Alger Hiss, for one, was plugged into the highest levels of the American financial establishment. Had the trail been pursued, back into the Carnegie Endowment and beyond that, it could have been devastating. The trail was deliberately not pursued, and the reds still control the money.

In the period about 1948-1953—a mere moment in American history—there was enough public fury at American communists that they were actually forced out of many positions of power and influence—in unions, government, Hollywood, and so forth. Some screenwriters became the sainted "Hollywood Ten." We are to believe that they were actually out of work for a while, although they themselves later boasted that they produced plenty, under other names.

When Senator Joseph McCarthy (R-WI) began checking things out, it was absolutely essential to stop him before the whole mess of establishment collaboration with Lenin and Stalin unraveled before the eyes of a horrified public. So a "bipartisan" effort destroyed McCarthy. The liberals made "McCarthyism" a dirty word; thereafter, anyone looking for communists—and finding them!—was smeared with screams of "McCarthyism." "Looking for communists under beds" was the snide propaganda line of the time, when actually, you found them then, and find them now, behind government desks and in front of blackboards.

Liberal pressure-tactics made America safe for the communists again.

One essential key to understanding is that the "struggle" is not now and never has been between "capitalism and communism," but rather, between free enterprise and monopoly. One communist inversion of truth is that capitalism means monopoly. However, if we have monopolies it is only because they are protected by government. Under *laissez-faire* (a true free market, not the kind defined by Republicans and Democrats), there can be no sustained monopoly. There will always be a smart guy who comes along and says, "I can do it better;" and he very well may, if there is no government intervention to the benefit of his competitors to prevent him.

The only way a monopoly can be sustained is by means of government intervention through legislation, regulation, or subsidy. Government interference in business (as opposed to outright centralized "planning") by the means above is known as inter-

Continued on page 25

THE PARTISAN

The Conspiracy of Philosophy

by

M. O. Warren

PAO, Special Forces Underground

BLACK HELICOPTERS. Secret cabals of hidden influence. A massive “New World Order Conspiracy” whose tentacles reach into every facet of our lives—its minions just waiting for the hidden World Government’s orders to tattoo “666” bar codes onto our foreheads. It just doesn’t exist. No matter how much the NWO conspiracy believers want it to exist, it just doesn’t.

The possibility of a such a far-reaching and all-powerful secret “World Government” maintaining such a huge conspiracy for any length of time is beyond even the realms of fiction. It is impossible to imagine the resources that it would take - not to mention the number of people that would have to be in on it. Much like the old East German STASI, which employed 25 percent of East Germans to spy on the other 75 percent, and then used unpaid informants among the 75 percent to keep tabs on their spies! Why, even the most vocal of the NWO conspiracy theorists might be members of that conspiracy with orders to mislead and confuse us....

Enough! Conspiracies of people are fun, but they just aren’t there. At least not in the way they are presented.

“Ahh...”, say the conspiracists, “how do you explain the Trilateralists and the Council for Foreign Relations—with their members permeating business, government and the media throughout the US and Europe? How do you explain how their members serving in key roles in both Republican and Democratic administrations for dozens of years? How do you explain their secret meetings?”

The explanation is right there before us. There is in fact a conspiracy. A conspiracy far worse than any paranoid flight of fancy might create: *a conspiracy of philosophy*.

These organizations (the Trilateralists, the CFR) exist because a large number of influential people adhere to the same flawed statist philosophy. This philosophy, which fueled Franklin D. Roosevelt’s dictatorial transformation of this Republic into a socialist “democracy,” has dominated American politics in both parties since the 1930s. Like all philosophical revolutions, its roots extend farther into the past—but it was the crypto-communist F.D.R. who made it the cornerstone of American politics. The politics of compromise and 40 years of a Democrat controlled House enabled statist of all shades of red to undermine the Constitution straight through, and including, the alleged “Republican Revolution” of November 1994.

From the Missouri Compromise to Senator Robert Dole’s one man midnight “evil-looking rifles” compromise vote, *compromise* has been the Achilles Heel of the Republic. Formerly, the great congressional compromises merely delayed addressing issues; issues that festered into great crises with far-reaching consequences. Now, the statist have learned to manipulate compromise so that, in the end, they have conceded nothing and socialists have coincided all. The liberal media and socialist politicians praise their opponents for being “bipartisan” and “statesmen” while celebrating another victory for the supremacy of the all-powerful State and the further erosion of the status of sovereign citizen into that of peon.

The great truism of revolution is that it is a struggle of ideas, not of arms. This is a continuation of the struggle that led to our revolt against tyranny and then to the adoption of our Constitution—that singular document that enshrines the natural rights of Man and guarantees them against the tyranny of the State. Notice that I did not say “grants” or “gives”. Your rights as an individual are natural rights (in other words, they would exist in a “state of nature”, where the individual is sovereign and the State does not exist), they can not be “granted” or “given” to you. Your rights are unalienable, whether you choose to exercise them or not. Yet, as the Framers knew, the State can deny your rights, but only if you are stupid enough to grovel for “security.”

And it is to continue this most poignant struggle, that of a Free People against the natural inclination of the State to tyranny, that the Framers built separation of powers into the Constitution. They did it with *malice of forethought*, so the People would never become complacent—but rather be eternally vigilant.

Statism is the natural inclination of any government to tyranny. While it has a name, it is a philosophy, not a conspiracy. As in any philosophy, its believers can range from the benign to zealots. Woodrow Wilson was a benign statist (that sick species known as ‘do-gooder’)—he would probably be shocked (but not disappointed) to see the total transformation of the federal government that grew from his socialist idealism. Zealotry is personified in Franklin D. Roosevelt (Clinton’s hero), who believed that any whimsical end the State espoused justified any means to accomplish it.

Unfortunately, the wisdom of the Framers did not foresee the moral slough and intellectual bankruptcy that the American people would fall into when socialists promised them a free lunch and “retirement with dignity”—nor did they foresee the mischief that a communism sympathizing media would enable.

The paranoid fringe, with their delusions about FEMA conquering these United States from their underground bunker headquarters with an army of blue-helmeted Third World

thugs counting the cash in your pocket with a scanner from across the street are the best friends the statists have. While these misguided ones are busy forming militias to fight the UN and a Russian armored division living in salt mines below Detroit (or is it Kansas City?), they are actually *encouraging* the growth of statism. First, these obvious fantasies are held in ridicule by the majority or true patriots—and their most vocal adherents are adept at appearing ludicrous! Second, their activities both provoke and legitimize statist internal security measures which lead to greater acceptance of tyranny. The hapless so-called militias have done much to provoke and encourage the introduction of alleged anti-terrorist legislation that further promotes tyranny—let alone the damage done to the cause by fools who appear before Congress in fatigue uniform.

We must reject delusion and instead work to fight statism as a philosophy, a vile poison that has infected every venue of American society and politics. Our credo must remain the Constitution, the very bedrock that defines our Republic. The writings of the Federalists and Anti-Federalists, and other commentaries by the Framers (as well as those political philosophers who influenced them) provide us with insight that illuminates that document. We must guard against irrationalists who can not read the Constitution's plain English, or who seek to re-interpret it as a "living document."

To do this, we must speak out. In this and every other platform. We must vote—and be prepared to throw the compromising bastards out over and over again until our message is received. It takes direct, active involvement. We must demand accountability from our elected representatives and refuse to entertain the pronouncements of unelected pull-peddlers. We must re-capture our schools from the state, or refuse to send our children to them. And we must stay true to the ideological foundations of this Republic.

Compromise is certain death.



Moral Decision Game #2

with
R. Hemmerding

Last Issue's Dilemma (MDG #1)

INSTEAD of assaulting a town occupied by a People's Democratic Army (PDA) company (+) and getting your battalion (-) of the Continental Army chopped to pieces, you lay siege to it. After two months the PDA company (+) surrenders. You discover that during the siege the pro-PDA city government confiscated all privately owned stocks of food, that several hundred people died as a result of injuries inflicted during the confiscation, and that others have died as a result of "punishments for hoarding." How do you deal with those who ordered and carried out the confiscation and punishments? Would this incident change your conduct of future operations?

School Solution:
by R. Hemmerding.

PDA military and political POWs and collaborators who participated in property confiscation and "punishments for hoarding" are imprisoned, without rights, until local government is reestablished. The POWs are then tried in criminal court by a jury in the county within which their crimes were committed. This incident does not alter the conduct of future operations.

Commentary:

There can be no such thing as individual rights without the private acquisition, use, and disposal of property. Those who engage in the confiscation, expropriation, or conversion of property forfeit any claim to rights themselves. One of the most vile collectivist anti-property ideas is that the use of force is not justified to defend one's property. We deny this.

Winning Solution

by
"Offshore Bombardment"
S. Pasadena, FL

THE ACTIONS of the PDA are precisely the very actions that every communist, socialist or fascist government inflicts on its citizenry: the collectivization of property with its altruistic condemnation of "hoarding" as being a wicked crime against society. The proper response to the PDA is the same as if you were the liberating force entering any collectivist slave pen.

Any evidence that ties these aggressions with any particular person or persons should be preserved (if possible) and presented to the new civilian government (when available) for prosecution. Until then, the captured enemy will be retained as prisoners of war with no recourse to any kind of rights in a criminal or civil court.

In light of the civilian casualties, should you blindly take additional risks to rapidly take a city rather than placing it under siege during future engagements? No.

Commentary:

Risk taking must always take into consideration all values to be gained and values at risk. Soldiers defending individualism are a rare and precious value and should not be placed at risk without judging the value of that which is to be gained. For example, if the city contains great intellectual defenders of individualism, greater risks may be justified by the Continental Army.

The Continental Army is not responsible for any civilian casualties, whether they are inflicted by bloody dictators plying their Marxist response to a siege, or even losses due to CA bombardments of the city. (That is one additional tragedy

of living in a totalitarian state—you are at great risk of suffering the effects of war.)

If the people residing in the city are so blind to their plight that they have not long ago fled its wickedness, if they have not expended the effort to assist the CA's efforts to preserve their own liberty, then they are surely not worth risking our valuable lives. To sacrifice lives you value for the sake of those who lack value, is the evil morality (of altruism) that engulfs today's world—the very idea that must be uprooted from the minds of men if freedom is to have a future.

Summary: Most respondents argued that the POWs should be strung-up on the spot. Such an action may be gratifying, but that solution renders the liberators no more moral than the occupiers. The whole point is to reestablish the constitutional republic, not replace one "democracy" with another. Remember, under common law the POWs will be tried in the county where the crime was committed. Geneva is in Switzerland. All but one respondent recognized that decisions regarding future operations cannot be altered by this example. Although it was not a parameter of the dilemma (or one of our criterion for solution consideration), we found it curious that no respondent suggested reconstituting the militia with captured PDA weapons.

Moral Decision Game #2

FOLLOWING the liberation of the town in MDG #1, a platoon (-) of Continental Army Military Police and a split team of CA Special Forces advisors are assigned to provide basic interim police services and reconstitute and train the militia with the arms captured from the People's Democratic Army respectively. After local elections are held and constituted civil government is restored, the trials of the PDA prisoners of war begin. After thirty days of common law trial by jury, the PDA officers, NCOs, soldiers and civilian collaborators who ordered or oversaw the confiscation of food, and who ordered resisters killed or participated in their killing, are sentenced to hang. PDA soldiers who participated in the con-

fiscation without inflicting injury are sentenced to five years hard labor. The remainder are sent to a CA POW camp. On the day of the hangings, loyalists of the People's Democratic Party stage a peaceful anti-capital punishment demonstration. However, they are soon joined by a mob of PDP parasites demanding the restoration of their "civil rights" and the release of the PDA "martyrs." When the executions start the mob begins rioting. Looting begins shortly thereafter.

You are the junior CASF advisor and are present at the scene with a squad of CAMPs, and a platoon (-) of militia. How do you address the protest? What do you do when rioting begins? Should the executions be postponed?

Moral Decision Game is a contest. The winner will receive a one year subscription to *The RESISTER* (current subscribers will have their subscriptions extended for one year). The rules are simple: you are presented with a tactical, operational, or strategic dilemma. You must respond with a moral solution to the dilemma and an explanation of your solution. Your response will be judged against the objective criteria of the dilemma. The moral standard your solution is judged against is the philosophy of Objectivism. Your entry must be postmarked prior to 01 December, 1995.



POLINT

Continued from page 22

ventionism. Interventionism is based on the filthy socialist premise of *Ge-meinnutz geht vor Eigennutz* (i.e., the commonwealth ranks above private profit). Government intervention in business must inevitably result in socialism, either as *Wohlfahrtsstaat* (welfare state), *Zwangswirtschaft* (compulsory economy—National Socialism), or communism. Liberals are monopolists at heart, and what is socialism, what is communism, if not monopoly?

Treaties Define Fed Crime

Continued from page 21

therefore have an "international jurisdiction." Some of the above cases state that treaties do provide jurisdiction for the specified agency. Most of these agencies exercise the federal police power and enforce federal criminal laws; as mentioned previously, these crimes must fit within one of the constitutional categories of crimes which Congress may make penal, and that category could only be "offenses against the laws of nations."

The way a federal crime is made under the laws of nations is via treaties.

¹ See *Jabara v. Kelley*, 476 F.Supp. 561, 582 n. 17 (E.D. Mich. 1979): "[T]he Court is of the opinion that the FBI's investigative authority extends to authorized national security investigations involving foreign influences."

² The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service is as much a treaty based agency as the Pacific Salmon Commission; see 16 U.S.C., §3631.

³ There are only a few crimes mentioned in the U.S. Constitution which Congress can make penal: treason, via Art. 1, §6, cl. 1; counterfeiting, via Art. 1, §8, cl. 6; and piracy, felonies on the high seas and offenses against the laws of nations, via Art. 1, §8, cl. 10.



What is killing the liberals nowadays is the opening up of vast new channels of communication which quite literally "wire around" the controlled media. This terrifies them. It makes possible a wider recognition of their totalitarian nature and destructive practices.



BOOK REVIEWS

Legal Terrorism: The Truth About the Christic Institute. Dr. Susan Huck. New World Publishing Ltd., 1989. ISBN 0-9624273-3-0. ii + 171 pages, references and index. Hardback, \$22.00. Paperback, \$11.00.

Reviewed by J.F.A. Davidson

SEVERAL years ago, this writer was discussing the myriad internal security problems of an Asian island nation with one of that nation's senior police officials. Mid-way through our discussion my host became very solemn, and asked, "If you were to do one thing to cripple this insurgency, what would it be?" "Simple," I said. "Round up every Jesuit and Maryknoll priest, their lay workers, and all foreign Protestant charity 'volunteers,' put them against the wall, and shoot them." Of course this advice was not acted on, but it did open his eyes to the propaganda and disinformation spread by church altruists, the press, liberals and other "useful idiots" in concert with the aims and goals of the Communists.

The backdrop of Dr. Huck's book is the struggle against Communism in Nicaragua. Against this backdrop she describes in detail how the Christic Institute, self-described as "an interfaith center for law and public policy" came into being, who organized it, how it operates, where and from whom it gets its money, and what its real purpose is; legal terrorism. "We define legal terrorism," writes Dr. Huck, "as a form of political warfare. It does not place one life in imminent danger of death or dismemberment. What it does do is ruin the target's life. This is done by the law and through the courts. The objective of legal terrorism is to set a political agenda via the courts." The political agenda set is that of the Communist Party United States of America (CPUSA).

The primary weapon of the Christic Institute is the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) statute. The RICO statute is a leading example of deliberately ill written, unobjective, undefined legislation, "available for the pursuit of private, civil lawsuits as well as criminal cases." This "law" is used by the Christic Institute and its hooligan lawyers for the sole purpose of visiting financial ruin upon their carefully chosen victims. In every case brought to court by the Christic Institute the sole "crime" of the defendants has been their anti-Communism. In *Avirgan vs. Hull*, whose key "defendants" were Theodore Shackley and MG John Singlaub, even *The New York Times*, on March 17, 1989, questioned, "...what kind of evidentiary thread is woven through the Christic's tapestry of allegations that a 'secret team' of veterans of the Central Intelligence Agency, Cuban exiles, and soldiers of fortune spent thirty continent-hopping years dealing in drugs, arms, death, and anti-Communism." Dr. Huck demonstrates by her analysis of this case that there was in fact no evidence to back the Christic's case and that, "Basically, the Christics (tried) to convince the public—and, if possible, the court—that fighting Communists is nothing but a criminal activity."

Legal Terrorism is a gold mine of information about how Communists and Communist organizations in America are financed. Dr. Huck merely skims the surface of a sea of charities, tax exempt foundations, grants, and trusts that launder money for, and funnel money to, Communists. A large part of Communist funding derives from bleary eyed altruists carelessly tossing their dollars into Methodist, Presbyterian and Catholic collection plates while they squirm in their pews soaking in the pleasure of being called sinful and selfish. The World and National Council of Churches, the Presbyterian Economic Development Corporation, the Veatch Program of the Unitarian Universalist Society (to name a few), and innumerable Catholic charities, know just where that money will do the most good for the cause of "world peace." Dr. Huck contends that main-

stream church funding of the left is largely responsible for members abandoning churches altogether, or shifting toward fundamentalist and evangelical groups. She notes, "The 'mainline' church bureaucrats are probably more displeased with the latter outcome, as it is a dogma of leftist church manipulators that atheism is preferable to 'the religious right.'"

Legal Terrorism is a textbook for the study of the establishment, funding, and operation of a single Communist front organization among scores. For anybody who dreams of the day when Communists twist in the wind for their treason on the behalf of the Soviet Union, this book is a necessary reference.

It may be ordered from:

Dr. Susan Huck
PO Box 68
Church Hill, MD 21623

Best Feds

Continued from page 14

documents were turned over voluntarily, by an attorney, to the FBI.

"A citizen who legally obtains classified documents actually has an affirmative obligation to return them," Pate said. "As a journalist, I weigh that against the news value of the information and the people's right to know. Those documents had nothing of inherent news value, and could have been used to endanger the lives of ATF agents. It seemed best, under the circumstances, to return the stuff to the feds. It was a judgment call. I might make a different choice under different circumstances."

★

The legal effect of these constitutional recognitions of the rights of individuals to defend their property, liberties, and lives, against the government, is to legalize resistance to all injustice and oppression, of every name and nature whatsoever, on the part of the government.

Lysander Spooner, 1852

Shakedown: How the Government Screws You from A to Z. James Bovard. Viking, Penguin Books USA Inc., New York, 1995. ISBN 0-670-86542-7. ix + 132 pages. \$14.95.

Reviewed by J.F.A. Davidson

WE CAN imagine the frustration socialists have felt for the past 150 odd years while attempting to find loopholes in the Constitution through which to infiltrate their noxious ideas. Small wonder then that they have concentrated their assaults against individual rights, liberties, and ownership of property on an amorphous clause in Article I, Section 8 which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;..." The amorphous clause in question is of course the phrase, "general welfare."

Imagine the evil glee experienced by the first socialist to twist the idea that the "general welfare" clause was a license to re-focus the monopoly of force embodied in Congress from providing for "the common defense and general welfare" to providing for welfare generally. *Shakedown* is a record of the inevitable results of government infected by altruists, collectivists, mystics, and statist compromising with one another in order to appear to be "doing something" about the whimsies of every special interest group with a letterhead and a few shrieking voices, and appeasing Molotov cocktail waving minorities demanding their "civil rights."

All the federal agencies that grew out of Roosevelt's so-called New Deal, the "civil rights" movement, Johnson's Great Society programs, and Bush's War on Drugs have no authority under the Constitution. Yet they are governments unto themselves, and their minions exercise power solely because they have it. "The thicker that government statute books become," writes Mr. Bovard, "the greater the imbalance in power between the citizen and the State."

The exponential growth of "laws" is coincident with the growth of government and synonymous with the slow death our liberties. As laws are piled upon laws they become increasingly unobjective and irrational. "We need fewer laws," Mr. Bovard argues. "Every unnecessary law undermines the enforcement of necessary laws. Laws are not simply political wish-lists and planks in political reelection campaigns, but acts forcibly administering on people's lives." Indeed, this is the central theme of *Shakedown*; illustrating the effects of socialist "law" on the average citizen, and the horrors that must inevitably result.

Shakedown spans the range of abuses and abrogation of individual liberties beginning with the racist quota system of affirmative action, and ending with collectivist, anti-property zoning laws. The outrages of socialist "law" described in *Shake-Down* extend from the horrifying example of federal judge Joyce Hens Green's 1993 ruling that a hepatitis B infected Washington D.C. firefighter's so-called civil rights were violated because "he was specifically prohibited from doing mouth-to-mouth resuscitation," to the ludicrous citation of an LA strip joint under the Americans with Disabilities Act for having a shower stall on stage with no access for cripples in wheelchairs.

Shakedown is a long awaited and welcome addition to Mr. Bovard's *Lost Rights: The Destruction of American Liberties*. Few writers have Mr. Bovard's ability to pick illustrative examples of the logical results of socialist "law" from the miasma of the daily exercise thereof. Once you begin reading *Shakedown* you will read it through to the end. When you are done you will recognize the injustices that you are subjected to every day. "We owe it to ourselves and to our children," concludes Mr. Bovard, "to stand up and reclaim the liberty that once made this nation revered around the world."

✱

Manuals for the Unorganized Militia

In these times of federal conspiracy to cement their abrogation of the Constitution, patriots must possess the knowledge of *how* to resist tyranny. *The RESISTER* is offering a series of manuals on the nuts-and-bolts of resistance. Topics include: **Organization, Logistics, Intelligence, and Operations.** Defend your liberty against the socialist New World Order with knowledge as well as arms.

Now Available:

....How to Spot Informants

An ATF training manual detailing the training, operations, and management of informants and undercover operatives.

\$10.00

....Principles of Tradecraft

A primer detailing the essential requirements for the training of intelligence personnel.

\$30.00

....How to Launder Money

Actually two books in one: Part I is an FBI Academy training manual detailing how money is investigated; Part II describes how those investigative methods are circumvented.

\$25.00

....Firearms & Explosives Tracing Guidebook

An ATF National Tracing Center (NTC) manual detailing which firearms cannot be traced, and how explosives used in a crime are traced.

\$40.00

(We apologize for increasing the price of this manual from our Summer 1995 advance ad. Production costs dictated the change. Orders postmarked before 01/10/95 will be honored at the old price.)

Available in February:

JTF-Six Intelligence Guide

\$30.00

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____ ZIP _____

Terms: Cash or blank money order.

Send order to:

Militia Free Press, c/o The RESISTER, POB 47095, Kansas City, MO 64188

BLIND TRANSMISSION BROADCAST

The RESISTER's PGP public key's fingerprint is: 4F AC 23 C2 41 97 D6 CD B4 27 9D 21 73 67 E5 22

SFRZZRVQW 2742359-UUUU-
ZTR UUUUU
R 010001Z OCT 95 SFU
FM RESISTER POB 47095 KCMO 64188//SFUR-RES-SC//
TO ALCORRACT
INFO ALRESACT
BT
UNCLAS
MSGID/GENADMIN/SFUR-RES-SA/012001/OCT//
SUBJ/BLIND TRANSMISSION BROADCAST//
REF/A/CORRESPONDENCE/950701/951001/274//
NARR/1. CNSUD LKBMN CVHDF UDKVB VFGSK SACMX VXHNX JFDOF
NBVFN XJZOA WLGJF NBSWJ KWJDT VCGHD DZXNM ZXJUX ZUYS
FBDSD ERWUA SNCXC VBXDS AHYS D LJKGF NBFBC VGUH ADSBJ
ZMVCS DFHJK CZBXV CNSUD
BT YADFX ZCKVJ CPOHY SDXXN ZWHEG CNMWJ BHCZJ AXGCX
KVCBN KLFVJ KBZXG DFNFL HIVNI SWIUS ODFJN FHDIW OYRTU
HFGOS BNVFY KYWFF DKKVG SJSPC NCGHY DGSXC LVCLO FJFHB
NXVAS OCNCV FMFVK YADFX
BT LCCGF TYGXC MZBMN ZLDLF KVNZZ SLBGX BVFBN LNCBM
XJBZC VXBNM ZCNZC VJBNS ALXPS NEFXS NFVGC DJSUW GWDFS
VXCNC IVFIS MQJYS SRDDE RDCRH TGUJG HUGHH SFCAE QFWCZ
XCNSI CNSFH JEIWC LCCGF
2. SOAPBOX: IF YOU ARE STILL INTERESTED JUST SEND A
DISK WITH YOUR ADDRESS.
3. DAVID/ 4115/ WAS PUT TO GOOD USE. FIGURED IT WAS AN
OVERSIGHT.
4. LARRY/ BOX 267/ NORFOLK SEP 93/ PENDLETON NOV 93/
BRAGG NOV 93/ BUT NOT BY AUTHOR.
5. RAMON DOG/ WE HAVE TWO OURSELVES/ INFORMATION
PASSED/ IF YOU HAVE DOCUMENTATION THEY WOULD APPRECIATE
IT.
6. ROBERT P. M./ ANAHEIM/ DTG 010130Z AUG 95/ RE: 1
WHAT UNIT, WHERE, WHEN. / RE: 2.A. THAT EVENT WAS
CONVENIENT; 2.B. HOW, AMPLIFY; 2.C. DESCRIBE, DOCUMENT,
SEND/ RE: 3 AMPLIFY, TO WHAT EXTENT/ RE: 3.A. IF YOU
CAN PROVE IT SEND IT/ RE: 3.B. DOCUMENT/ RE: 3.C. FIND
SOURCE, SQUEEZE, SEND. BLUES ARE WELCOME. WRITE A LONG
LETTER.
7. DAN/ RT. 3/ AMPLIFY WE/ THEY WOULD NOT LET YOU WIN
BECAUSE THEY DID NOT WANT YOU TO WIN/ CALM DOWN/ FIRST
WE HAVE TO FIND `EM. THERE IS ALWAYS TIME TO FOLLOW UP
ON THE OTHER TWO.
8. RONALD/ BOX 157/ YOUR 13 AUG 95 IN HAND/ STAND-BY,
WORKING OUT THE DETAILS/ WE HAVE NOT FORGOTTEN.
9. D. PARKER/ 2743/ YOUR EXPERIENCE WOULD BE USEFUL BUT
AMPLIFY REQUEST AND REASON.
10. FRANK/ 302/ WE ARE INTERESTED IN YOUR SPECIALTY.
SEND A RESUME.
POC/POB47095 KCMO 64188//
RMKS/RESPONSE S: 012400 DEC 95//
BT

NNNN

The RESISTER ON-LINE

SINCE we first began publishing *The RESISTER* it has been transcribed by readers and uploaded into many Bulletin Boards and Newsgroups. On several occasions, while reviewing these posts, we have found text alterations. In some instances these alterations have resulted in substantive changes in content and context. In order to resolve this problem we agreed to a contractual arrangement with I BBS of Minneapolis MN to post our original, PGP signed ASCII version of *The RESISTER* on I BBS. Access to *The RESISTER* on I BBS is by subscription only. This is your guarantee of the accuracy and truth of the electronic version. If you do not get your electronic version from I BBS there is no guarantee that what you are reading is a true copy of *The RESISTER*. Hard-copy subscribers already know they are getting the real thing.

Electronic subscribers will find that they are authorized to download *The RESISTER* PGP public key (which includes the e-mail address in the key ID). Hard-copy subscribers must use the following procedure to obtain the same privilege:

1) Mail your e-mail address to the KCMO address. Include the name you subscribed under and your return address.

2) We will send a message with *The RESISTER* public key in the message body (you will have no difficulty identifying who it is from).

3) Follow the instructions in the message.

This privilege is for subscribers only. Traffic from unauthorized users will be deleted without being read.

Note: The systems operator for I BBS is not affiliated with *The RESISTER* or associated with Special Forces Underground.

Open Letter

Continued from page 2

manipulate at will?

Would you prefer an Army dedicated to the defense of a sovereign America against foreign aggression, and devoted to its legitimate sovereign interests, or an Army subordinate to a United Nations founded by communists, run by communists, and dedicated to one-world communism?

Would you prefer an Army that unflinchingly defends capitalism, the guarantor of true liberty, or an Army of socialist serfs?

Would you prefer an Army subordinate to civilian control in a constitutional republic, or an Army subject to the dictates of the latest totalitarian darling of competing gangs of democracy worshipping collectivists fighting over the ruins of capitalism for their "fair share" of the loot?

Would you prefer an Army in which advancement and promotion was based solely on individual merit, or an Army dedicated to tribal balkanization and the racist policy of so-called affirmative action?

The Special Forces Underground has made it clear that we stand for the former conditions in the above questions without exception or compromise. We reject all socialist premises. The opposition, by their words and deeds, clearly advocates the later conditions. Their official pronouncement that they find *The RESISTER* "objectionable" speaks volumes about where their true loyalties lay. The opposition's fear of *The RESISTER* is the unspoken fear of all tyrannies: independent thought.

Since its inception, Special Forces

Underground has been slowly gathering together the few remaining true patriots in the United States military; soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who will not compromise on the principles of individual rights, strict constitutionalism, limited government (unalterably divided by separation of its legislative, judicial and executive powers), isolationism, laissez-faire capitalism, and constitutional republicanism. Given the climate of fear perpetuated by the socialist opposition this is no easy task.

The RESISTER is the psychological warfare voice of the Special Forces Underground. The purposes of *The RESISTER* are to 1) educate the U.S. military about the true meaning and intent of the Constitution they took an oath to defend, 2) expose the Marxists, internationalists and statists in the U.S. military and shine a light on their activities, and 3) coalesce the capitalist resistance against communism and socialism.

Special Forces Underground raises funds to continue our fight against socialism by subscriptions to *The RESISTER*, through its subsidiary, the *Militia Free Press*, and by the voluntary donations of sympathizers and supporters. In other words, our fund raising is unashamedly capitalistic. If you truly desire to live as a free man (a condition possible only under capitalism) we ask for your voluntary support to help us educate the U.S. military about their constitutional responsibilities, and educate the militia—the armed citizenry—how to resist tyranny and the unspeakable evils of socialism, in all their guises.

Life, Liberty, Property
J.F.A. Davidson



Zombie Slave?

Continued from page 14

though publicized in the Haitian press, has been ignored by the U.S. media.

In the days leading up to Clinton's visit, according to sources in Haiti, many occult preparations took place. These were intended not only to grant Clinton (power over) the challenges facing his presidency but also to give Aristide the power to continue to control Clinton.

One account circulating here—totally unconfirmable, but accepted as true by many Haitians—is that when Aristide dedicated the "secret well" before Clinton's visit, he "shed the blood of a newborn infant in gratitude to the gods whom he believes allowed his return to power."

Therefore, in the days just before Clinton's arrival, the well became the scene of eerie nightly voodoo ceremonies, the drums and incantations conducted by Aristide's voodoo experts as the site was further empowered and sanctified.

To maximize the occult forces at work, even the date chosen for Clinton's visit—March 31—was part of an elaborate ritual. The digits are the reverse of "13," which the voodoo calendar considers the most important date for casting spells.

Several persons in voodoo circles close to Aristide assert that Clinton's will is now permanently enslaved to that of Aristide—a "zombie slave" so to speak—and that, after the ceremony, Clinton never again can resist any demands made upon him by the Haitian president.

© 1995 by Aida Parker Newsletter (Pty) Ltd. (P.O. Box 91059, Auckland Park 2006, Johannesburg, South Africa.) Used by permission.

The RESISTER

Post Office Box 47695, Kansas City, MO 64188

Single Issue \$ 6.00(Current)
Four Issues \$20.00(One year)
Back Issue \$ 7.00(each,Grey)

☐ New ☐ Renewal

TERMS: Cash or money order (Please leave "PAY TO THE ORDER OF" blank.) No checks (they are unsecure). Please allow 4 - 6 weeks for your distribution to begin.

"The instability of our laws is really an immense evil."

Thomas Jefferson

112

NAME/PSEUDONYM _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

WE TOLD YOU SO!

THE CURRENT perception that the U.S. military is supposed to remain apolitical is the result of years of socialist disinformation. This disinformation extends from the classroom where young officers are taught, to the office of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is one reason *The RESISTER* is feared. A non-political military simply does not become *involved* in politics. The socialists insist the U.S. military must remain *apolitical*, which means not *concerned* with politics. There is a huge difference between these terms. Socialists want you to forget that words have meaning.

We recently received a letter from Will California, a former 1LT in the "Brown Shoe" Army. Mr. California included a xerographic copy of Training Manual No. 2000-25. "Citizenship." War Department, Washington, November 30, 1928. This Manual was used in conjunction with the publication *The Constitution of the United States*, by Harry Atwood, during the **POLITICAL** training of soldiers. We quote:

"Democracy:

A government of the masses.

Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of "direct" expression.

Results in mobocracy

Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights.

INFLATION IS GOVERNMENT THEFT

**Announcing a Price Increase:
Subscribe or Re-subscribe Now and Save**

A S A DIRECT RESULT of the federal government's socialist economic policies, its practice of economic interventionism for the benefit special interest lobbies, and its Keynesian deficit spending policies, we regret the necessity of increasing the price of subscription. The publishing industry in general has been particularly affected due to interventionism on behalf of the eco-communist and neo-feudalist lobbies. Paper prices and publishing costs have increased to the point where *The RESISTER*'s expanded size and planned format change will result in a net loss if the subscription price is held at the current level. Therefore, **beginning 01 January, 1996, the subscription price will increase to \$25.00 per annum. (\$7.00 for current issue, and \$8.00 ea. for back issues.)**

So, use the subscription form on the obverse of this announcement, and if we receive your voluntary support postmarked no later than 31 December, 1995, your subscription will be honored at the current prices listed there.

We will not apologize for this increase because that would be conceding to the philosophical premises of the socialists in Washington DC. **Inflation is government theft by looting**, and we are no less victims of government looting than you. **JOIN THE CAPITALIST COUNTER-REVOLUTION.** Subscribe or resubscribe now, and urge your associates to whom you give bootleg copies to do the same.

Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences.

Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

And further on:

"Our Constitutional fathers, familiar with the strength and weakness of both autocracy and democracy, with fixed principles definitely in mind, defined a representative republican form of government. They 'made a very marked distinction between a republic and a democracy...and said repeatedly and emphatically that they had founded a republic.'"

This Training Manual was signed:
BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR:
C.P. SUMMERALL, Major General,
Chief of Staff. It was prepared by:
LUTZ WAHL, Major General, The
Adjutant General.

Next time you hear your commanders talk about promoting "democracy," remind them that 70 years ago they would have been declared subversives, traitors to the Republic, and in violation to their oath to defend the Constitution.

Next time you hear your commanders derrogate *The RESISTER*, remind them that 70 years ago it would have been held-up as an example of service in defense of the Constitution and its founding principles.

J.F.A. Davidson

***Democracy and socialism
are inseparable.***

V. I. Lenin

NOTICE:

If you are subscribing under a pseudonym, or if you are using a mail-drop, it is YOUR responsibility to ensure mail is delivered to you. We cannot reasonably be held responsible for mail that cannot be delivered to you if you are supplying notional information.